STATE OF MICHIGAN 1 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF WAYNE 2 3 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN 4 5 Case No. 03-001609 6 .vs MICHON DESMOND HOUSTON, 7 Defendant. 8 9 JURY TRIAL 10 11 PROCEEDINGS HAD in the above-entitled cause before 12 the HONORABLE VERA MASSEY JONES, Circuit Judge, Detroit, 13 Michigan on Monday, April 7th, 2003. 14 15 APPEARANCES: 16 RODNEY P. HASSINGER P-40573) COUNTY Wayne County Assistant For the People: 17 Wayne County Assistant Prosecutor 1441 St. Antoine Street, 18 Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 224-5777 19 20 DAVID E. LANKFORD (P-43536) 21 For the Defendant: 645 Griswold Street, Suite 2350 Detroit, MI 48226 22 (313) 965-4834 23 24

25

Γ		•
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
		PAGE
2	WITNESSES: PEOPLE	
3		
4	OFFICER MELVIN WILLIAMS	
_	Cross-Examination continuing by Mr. Lankford	4 7
5	Redirect Examination by Mr. Hassinger	7
6		
7	OFFICER CHARLES ADAMS	9
′	Direct Examination by Mr. Hassinger Cross-Examination by Mr. Lankford	26
3 	Redirect Examination by Mr. Hassinger	30
	Recross-Examination by Mr. Lankford	30
9	Redirect Examination by Mr. Hassinger	31
	Recross-Examination by Mr. Lankford	31
)		
L		
	The People Rests	35 46
2	The Defense Rests	47
,	Closing argument by Mr. Hassinger Closing argument by Mr. Lankford	62
'	Rebuttal argument by Mr. Hassinger	86
	Court charges the jury	97
•	Jury renders a verdict	122
;		
5		
7		
3	EXHIBITS: IDENTIFIED	RECEIVED
9	None	
,		
)		
L		
2		
3		
4		
5		

Detroit, Michigan 1 Monday, April 7, 2003 2 Morning session 3 4 THE CLERK: All rise for the jury. 5 (Jury enters courtroom) 6 THE COURT: Do I have the stipulation that 7 all of our jurors are here and in their proper 8 places? 9 10 MR. HASSINGER: People so stipulate. MR. LANKFORD: Defense also. 11 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I 12 apologize to you, but you know when you make real 13 good plans I'm supposed to take two weeks off in 14 May to help my daughter with the new baby that's 15 going to be born May 22nd. Well, the baby decided 16 to come Friday and at 10:40 we were on our way to 17 the hospital at 3:00 o'clock in the morning, and I 18 have a new granddaughter, a baby girl. 19 20 (Audience clapped) THE COURT: Thank you. But that's why I 21 22 wasn't here. Now, I'll remind the witness you're still under. Sir, would you please resume the 23 24 witness stand. 25 You may proceed, counsel.

MR. LANKFORD: Thank you. 1 2 OFFICER MELVIN WILLIAMS was thereupon called as a witness by the People 3 herein and having been previously duly sworn, was 4 examined and testified as follows: 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION, continuing 6 7 BY MR. LANKFORD: 8 0. Officer Williams, good morning? Α. Good morning. 9 10 MR. LANKFORD: May I set this briefly up, Your Honor? 11 12 THE COURT: Go right ahead. 13 MR. LANKFORD: I think where we left off, 14 Your Honor, is Officer Williams is at the diagram. 15 If you could please, sir. 16 BY MR. LANKFORD: 17 Q. I want to ask you a couple of things. I think we 18 had gone through your position when you first saw 19 something in the alley you had come past a clump of 20 weeds and then a pile of debris and near where that 21 light pole is, sir, here? 22 Α. No, no, on Buena Vista. 23 0. I'm going to get your bearings, correct. 24 Α. Okay. 25 Is that right, sir, you had come by a clump of Ο.

weeds and a pile of debris near where that light 1 pole is? 2 3 You mean my vehicle? Α. Your vehicle, yes, sir. 4 Q. 5 A. Correct. And also you had been talking about 2638 Glendale, 6 Q. 7 right? 8 Α. Correct. And you can see a 2638 Buena Vista on that diagram, 9 Q. 10 sir? Right here is the area. 11 Α. And Glendale would be the next block south? 12 Q. 13 Α. Correct. And the number there is sequential in the same 14 Q. pattern as what's depicted there? 15 On Glendale? 16 Α. 17 Q. Yes, sir. Well, it's not showing here but --18 Α. Okay, you're familiar with the area from patrol? 19 Q. 20 Α. Yeah. That area west of Linwood is the 2600 block over on 21 Q. Buena Vista and on Glendale? 22 23 Α. Correct. Okay, thank you, if you would please, sir, you may 24 Q. resume your seat if you would, officer. 25

And at the time that you arrived you were 1 talking about doing some canvasing then you stay in 2 the area for a while, sir, would that be fair? 3 Α. Yes, sir. 4 And set up some type of preliminary security? 5 Q. Yes, sir. 6 Α. 7 And do you remain until the Investigator Jackson or Q. the evidence tech arrive? 8 Yes, sir. 9 Α. Okay, so you were the one that found Mr. Thomas? 10 Q. Yes, I was. 11 Α. And you were there when the evidence tech did 12 Q. 13 arrive, correct, sir? Yes, I was. 14 Α. And you point out the area where you had seen the 15 Q. things, correct? 16 17 Yes, I did. Α. All right. 18 Q. At any time while you were there did you 19 remove or recover any shell casings? 20 No, I didn't. 21 Α. At any time while you were there, did a person by 22 Q. the name of Lavero Crooks approach you in any way? 23 24 No. Α.

One moment, please.

25

Q.

So you did indicate though the time that 1 you were coming down Buena Vista dawn was breaking? 2 In other words, it was getting light as you made 3 that? 4 5 Yes, sir. Α. You get no weeds in the field impeded your vision 6 Q. 7 of the body? Α. No, sir. 8 MR. LANKFORD: Thank you, nothing else. 9 THE COURT: Any redirect? 10 MR. HASSINGER: Briefly, Judge. 11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. HASSINGER: 13 Okay, Officer Williams, I wanted to clear up one 14 Q. thing that was confusing myself, at least over the 15 16 weekend, why don't you come back down to the diagram for me for one second, please. 17 Now, when you found Mr. Thomas there in 18 the field, did you yourself personally observe any 19 blood in the field? 20 21 Α. Yes, I did. 22 Q. Okay. And you see where on our diagram there is 23 some blood indicated with a round circle in front 24 25 of a tree, correct?

1	Α.	Right here?
2	Q.	Yes.
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	Okay.
5		Now in relation to that blood did you
6		find Mr. Thomas?
7	Α.	Mr. Thomas sat maybe right here and then there was
8		blood here.
9	Q.	Can you give us any idea the distance between the
10		blood indicated on our chart and how far Mr. Thomas
11		was from it?
12	A.	Foot and a half, maybe two feet.
13	Q.	I know you didn't actually measure that, right?
14	A.	No, I didn't.
15	Q.	But that's your best estimate today a foot and a
16		half to two feet?
17	Α.	Correct.
18		MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Judge. I have
19		nothing further.
20		MR. LANKFORD: No re-cross. Thank you.
21	: 	THE COURT: We thank and excuse the
22		witness. You're free to go.
23		THE WITNESS: Thank you, ma'am.
24		THE COURT: Are you ready to call your
25		next witness?

MR. HASSINGER: Yes, we'd like to call 1 2 Officer Adams. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. 3 Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony 4 5 you're about to give before the court to be the truth under the pains of penalty of perjury? 6 7 MR. ADAMS: I do. MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Judge. 8 9 THE COURT: Please be seated right there, 10 and we're going to ask you to speak right into the 11 microphone. Counsel, whenever you're ready. 12 MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 CHARLES ADAMS 14 was thereupon called as a witness herein and having 15 been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 16 follows: 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HASSINGER: 18 19 Q. Good morning, sir, would you please introduce yourself 20 to our jury? 21 Hello, my name is Officer Charles Adams. Α. 22 Q. And how are you employed, sir? 23 With the Detroit Police Department. Α. Sir, I'd like to take you back to November 9th of 24 Q. 25 last year, 2002 at Saturday 1:15 in the p.m.

you recall if you were working back on that date 1 around that time? 2 Yes, I was. 3 Α. Can you tell us how long you've been a police 4 Ο. officer? 5 Approximately eight years. 6 Α. Back on that date around that time, what was your 7 Ο. assignment? 8 I was working 36, I don't specifically know what 9 Α. particular car I was working. 10 11 Q. Okay. Around that time did you come into 12 contact with somebody by the name of Lavero Crooks? 13 Yes, I did. Α. 14How was it you came in contact with Mr. Crooks back 15 Q. on that date? 16 Prior to that particular time at our roll call at 17 Α. the beginning of the shift what we were doing we 18 were looking at some of the prior PCR's, which are 19 preliminary complaint reports, different crimes 20 that had happened. And we put together a description 21 22 of a particular individual and a particular area where things were happening and that's what we were 23

Q. Okay.

24

25

interviewing Mr. Crooks about.

And where did you first meet up with 1 2 Mr. Crooks? We went to his home. I don't remember the address. 3 Α. I need my PCR to recollect. 4 MR. HASSINGER: May I approach the 5 witness, Your Honor? 6 7 THE COURT: Yes, you may. BY MR. HASSINGER: 8 Sir, I'm going to hand you a piece of paper and ask 9 Q. you if you can identify this for me, please? 10 This is the PCR that I made earlier in the day 11 Α. 12 during the arrest. So you met up with Mr. Crooks at his home? 13 Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 Okay, and how was it you knew where Mr. Crooks Ο. lived? 16 17 One of the reports that were made earlier from the Α. felonious assault that happened to Mr. Crooks. 18 was the complainant. 19 Was Mr. Crook at his home when you arrived there? 20 Q. 21 Α. Yes, he was. 22 Was anybody else with you? Q. Yes, my partner was, my scout car partner. 23 Α. What's that's person's name? 24 Q. That's going to be Olivia Moss, Police Officer 25 Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Olivia Moss. And when you went to Mr. Crooks' house, did you Q. develop any type of plan to try and get a suspect in custody? Yes, we did. Α. What was the plan you developed? Q. After talking to Mr. Crooks, after interviewing him Α. he said that --MR. LANKFORD: Objection, hearsay. MR. HASSINGER: This is going to explain what actually --THE COURT: It goes to the reasons for the actions, not for the truth of the matter stated. I'll overrule the objection. MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. HASSINGER: Go ahead. Q. After receiving the information, we're talking to Α. Mr. Crooks and he explained to me that Mr. Houston would come out after when Mr. Crooks got in that area. What area are we talking about? Q. We're talking about Buena Vista and Linwood. Α. Is that an area you're personally familiar with? 0. Yes. Α.

How is it you're familiar with that area? 0. 1 It's a high crime area. Heavy drug infestation. 2 Α. I've made several arrests in that location. 3 Q. 4 Okay. Did Mr. Crooks have an address where he 5 6 believed you could find Michon Houston? 7 Yes, he did. Α. And do you know what that address is? 8 Q. Going back to my PCR. 9 Α. 10 Would that help refresh your memory? Q. 11 Α. Yes, it would. Please do. 12 Q. 13 Α. 2675 West Buena Vista. What specifically is your plan about how you're 14 Q. 15 going to get Mr. Houston in custody? Me and my partner were working plain clothes or 16 Α. semi-marked where we don't have police uniforms or 17 anything like that. Basically we have our badge 18 around our neck. You know, if you cover up your 19 20 badge you can look like anybody else. 21 We parked away from the location and we walked -- we were like east of this particular 22 address, this 2675. And we pretty much just sat up 23 24 on the porch.

How far away from the house where Mr. Houston was

25

Q.

supposed to be? 1 Approximately about 100 feet, I'd say. 2 Α. Now, after you and your partner setup, what's Mr. 3 Q. Crooks supposed to do? 4 Mr. Crooks is supposed to do his normal. 5 Α. supposed to come back over in that area, park his 6 7 car and hopefully Mr. Houston would show up. Now, what did you know about Mr. Crooks prior to 8 Ο. setting up this arrangement with him? 9 Well, I knew that he did frequent the area. 10 Α. suspected for selling drugs over in that area too. 11 So you knew -- go ahead. 12 Ο. Suspected for selling drugs in that area. I'm going 13 Α. to say based on my information and my knowledge as 14 a police officer that he was selling drugs in that 15 16 area. 17 0. Okay. And even though you knew that he was a 18 guy who sold narcotics over there, you were still 19 willing to setup this system with him to try to get 20 21 Mr. Houston into custody? Yes, because basically I was -- we were 22 Α. investigating the crime that happened to him, even 23 though what he was doing over there was illegal, a 24 crime that happened and that's what we were 25

investigating. 1 2 Ο. Okay. So after you and your partner get setup, 3 do you see Mr. Crooks driving on Buena Vista? 4 Yes, he was coming westbound. He crossed Linwood 5 Α. and came up Buena Vista westbound. He pulled up 6 7 parked his car and see if he can get him out. Where did Mr. Crooks park his car in relationship 8 Q. to this house that Mr. Houston was supposed to be 9 in? 10 I want to say approximately maybe not directly 11 Α. across the street from it, but maybe about a house 12 before that on the opposite side of the street. 13 exited his vehicle. You know, as he exited his 14 vehicle, you know, people in the neighborhood 15 because they knew that he was into it with Mr. 16 17 Houston, the neighborhood kind of --MR. LANKFORD: I'm going to object, Your 18 Honor. 19 THE COURT: Sustained. You can't tell what 20 was in other people's mind. 21 BY MR. HASSINGER: 22 Just tell you what you observed? 23 Q. I observed the neighborhood got kind of quiet. 24 25 People got aroused at the fact that he showed up.

You can see people starting to notice. They 1 stopped and looked at him because they knew 2 3 something was about to happen or that's what I assumed that they felt that something was about to 4 happen. 5 Did you make any observations about that house 6 Ο. where Mr. Houston was supposed to be? 7 Mr. Houston came out of the front door onto 8 Α. 9 the porch. For the record do you see Mr. Houston here in the 10 Ο. 11 courtroom today? Yes, I do. 12 Α. 13 Q. Could you point to him and tell us what he's wearing today, please? 14 He's wearing a black shirt with beige pants and 15 Α. black shoes with his hair braided to the back with 16 17 the two tear drops. MR. HASSINGER: Judge, I'd like the record 18 to reflect he's identified the defendant in this 19 20 case Mr. Michon Houston. THE COURT: All right. 21 BY MR. HASSINGER: 22 23 Q. Okay, you see Mr. Houston come out on the porch? 24 Α. Yes. 25 What happens next? Q.

He yelled something towards Mr. Crooks. Mr. Crooks 1 Α. started yelling back at him. Well, actually Mr. 2 Houston stayed on the porch. And as Mr. Crooks was 3 crossing the street, he wasn't going to him, he 4 was going to another house. I guess he didn't see 5 where me and my partner --6 7 MR. LANKFORD: Judge, speculation, Your 8 Honor. THE COURT: Sustained. Officer don't tell 9 us what you think was in their minds. Just tell us 10 what you actually saw. Go ahead. 11 MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Judge. 12 THE WITNESS: As he walked across the 13 street they kept yelling back and forth. They kept 14 yelling back and forth and then Mr. Crooks yelled 15 out there's that mother-fucker right there. 16 17 BY MR. HASSINGER: Was he pointed at anybody when he said that? 18 Q. 19 Yes, he pointed toward Mr. Houston. Α. Where are you at that time when Mr. Crooks says 20 Ο. those words? 21 Me and my partner are located northeast. We were 22 Α. on opposite side of the street. But east of there 23 24 at that particular time because we were trying to 25 move up, we didn't want to make ourself

conspicuous, but after he yelled out and he looked 1 in our direction we just went on and started 2 closing. We ran towards the house closing the gap. 3 You said he looked in your direction, who are you Ο. 4 referring to? 5 Mr. Houston. 6 Α. 7 You have badges around your neck; is that what you 0. testified to? 8 At that particular time after we were starting we'd 9 Α. be running up identifying ourselves as the police 10 and we pulled out our badges. 11 12 Q. Okay. So you're actually running towards Mr. 13 Houston at this time? 14 15 Yes. Α. And what words were you saying? 16 Q. Detroit Police. 17 Α. What does Mr. Houston do when you're running up 18 Ο. towards him saying Detroit Police with your badge 19 out? 20 He runs back into the location. Α. 21 Now, tell the jury what's at that location? 22 Q. That's a location that is a fenced in four-family 23 Α. flat. It's two up. I guess you would say two up 24 25 north and south.

So there's two flats on the upper level and two Q. 1 flats on the lower level? 2 Yes. 3 Α. Once Mr. Houston runs into the front door of that Ο. 4 four-family flat, what do you do? 5 We didn't get a chance to actually see his hands 6 Α. and because the previous count was FA, we didn't 7 know whether he had a pistol or anything like 8 I ran to the rear to secure the location. 9 that. My partner stayed in front to secure the location. 10 And at that particular time we called for a 11 supervisor. 12 Q. Does a supervisor come to the scene? 13 14 Α. Yes. Did any other police officers come to the scene? 15 Q. Yes, several other cars came. 16 Α. 17 Q. Okay. And once you had a supervisor there and 18 other officers there, did you take any further 19 action? 20 Yes, we did. First we secured -- we talked to the Α. 21 supervisor and we let her know exactly what we 22 The supervisor saw the people that lived in 23 the building, came out of the building, and the 24

25

landlord of the building, I guess one of the

tenants showed up -- I mean had to call him, but he 1 showed up and as we talked to them, they gave us 2 permission to check their particular flat. 3 So did you check the two upper flats at that 4 Q. location? 5 Yes, we did. 6 Α. And you did that with the permission of owners of 7 Q. 8 those flats? 9 Α. Yes, we did. 10 Q. Okay. Did you find anything in those two upper 11 flats? 12 13 Α. No, we did not. Then there are two lower flats; is that correct? 14 Q. Yes, the lower right was unoccupied. The landlord 15 Α. had the keys. He gave us permission to go into 16 17 there. We checked that too. Q. One of the lower flats, the one to the right was 18 unoccupied? No one was renting that flat? 19 20 Α. Yes. Okay, did you go in that flat? 21 Ο. 22 Yes, we did. Α. Did you find anything in that flat? 23 Q. 24 No, we did not. Α.

25

Q.

Okay, so that leaves one lower flat on the left?

Yes. 1 Α. 2 Q. Okay. Was the person who resided in that flat 3 at the location? 4 Yes, he was. 5 Α. Did you talk to that person? 6 Q. Yes, after we talked to him he stated that he did 7 Α. not have a key to his door and usually he leaves it 8 unlocked. At that particular time when we checked 9 10 the door, the door was locked. 11 Ο. Okay. So the owner of that location told you he 12 had left the door unlocked? 13 Α. Yes. 14 But at this time when you're checking that lower 15 Q. 16 flat, the door is locked? 17 Α. Yes, it is. Now, during the course of this are you saying 18 Ο. anything to try and find Mr. Houston? 19 Yes. We are all the way through. We stating our 20 Α. name and our purpose that we're the Detroit Police 21 22 and that we were looking for Mr. Houston. know, asking him to come out and show his hands. 23 24 Ο. Okay. 25 So I just want to be clear to the jury.

The whole time you're doing this search of the 1 building in these flats, you are making it loud 2 enough if Mr. Houston wants to he's going to come 3 out? 4 5 Yes. Α. 6 Q. Okay. Did Mr. Houston ever voluntarily come out 7 of any of these flats? 8 No, he did not. 9 Α. 10 Q. Okay. So this last flat were the doors locked? 11 12 Are you able to get in that flat? Yes, the doors were locked, but the landlord, he's 13 Α. got the key to the door. 14 Did he have like a master key or something like 15 Q. that? 16 17 Α. Yes. 18 Q. Okay. And does he give you the key or does he 19 personally unlock that flat? 20 No, he gives us the key. After we talk to the 21 Α. 22 tenant he gave him permission to give us the key to go into it. 23 Okay, and do you personally unlocked the door? 24 25 Α. Yes, I do.

- Q. Once you unlock the door, are you able to open the door?
 - A. No, not directly because it had resistance. There was resistance behind the door like somebody was trying to keep the door closed.
 - Q. And again, are you saying stuff at this time?
 - A. Detroit Police.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

- Q. Is there any response?
- A. No, there is not.
- Q. What do you do?
 - A. I still yell Detroit Police, turn the key, and then
 I'm pushing the door feeling the resistance. Then
 I pushed the door a little bit harder and I stated
 again, Detroit Police, get back away from the door.
 - Q. What happens then?
 - A. Maybe for a half a second or so, he stayed on the door and then he let the door go and then at that time we went in, put him to the ground and frisked him and handcuffed him.
- 20 Q. Now, who are you referring to?
- 21 A. Mr. Houston.
 - Q. The person you identified here in court today?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. He was placed under arrest at that time?
- 25 A. Yes, he was.

Was anybody else in that particular flat besides 1 Q. Mr. Houston? 2 No, there was not. 3 Α. Did Mr. Houston claim he lived in that flat? 4 Q. No, he did not. 5 Α. In fact, at some point he gives you an address 6 Q. where he lives; is that correct? 7 Yeah. 8 Α. Can you tell us what address Mr. Houston gave you? 9 Q. 10 Α. Referring back to my PCR. If that would help refresh your memory. 11 Q. 12142 Plainview. 12 Α. So that's obviously not an address on Buena Vista 13 Q. there, correct? 14 15 Α. No, it is not. Mr. Houston is then placed in custody? 16 Q. Yes, he is. 17 Α. 18 Do you do any other searching in or around the Q. 19 front of that four-family flat? 20 Α. Yes, we do because it was reported that he possibly had had a -- the particular complaint that we were 21 following up on stated that or the information we 22 received that he had a shot gun, a sawed off shot 23 gun and we searched for that particular weapon.

Did you recover any weapons?

24

25

Q.

1	A. No, we did not.
2	Q. Did you recover anything else?
3	A. No, I did not.
4	Q. Did you see anything, other evidence that was
5	recovered from that location?
6	A. I need to refer back to my PCR to make sure I
7	didn't.
8	Q. Would that help refresh your memory?
9	A. Yes, it would.
10	I did not recover anything else. One of
11	the other scout cars recovered some narcotics.
12	Q. Did you see that being recovered?
13	MR. LANKFORD: Objection, relevance, Your
14	Honor.
15	THE COURT: Did he see it being recovered
16	is relevant, so I'll have to overrule the
17	objection.
18	THE WITNESS: No, I did not.
19	THE COURT: If any information is
20	stricken, the jury's totally to disregard it. It's
21	hearsay.
22	MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	BY MR. HASSINGER:
24	Q. Sir, I'd like to then take you to November 13th,
25	2002. I believe that would be a Wednesday around

9:15 in the a.m. Sir, do you recall if you had 1 contact again that day with Lavero Crooks? 2 3 Α. Yes. And why did you have contact with Mr. Crooks on 4 Ο. that day? 5 After this particular arrest, we had received some 6 Α. information that there had been a shooting done at 7 that particular area. A homicide had taken place 8 and that possibly --9 MR. LANKFORD: Objection, speculation, 10 plus, I don't see any relevance after Mr. Houston's 11 arrest, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: I'm going to have to sustain 13 the objection unless the Prosecutor can come over 14 and give me an offer of proof. 15 MR. HASSINGER: Judge, I just wanted to 16 17 establish basically that he had contact with Mr. Crooks. 18 THE COURT: Well, you got that. 19 MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Judge. 20 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? 21 22 MR. HASSINGER: Not on behalf of the People, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Cross-examination. 24 CROSS-EXAMINATION 25

BY MR. LANKFORD: 1 Sir, you go out there -- officer Adams, good 2 0. 3 morning? Good morning. 4 Α. You go out there following up on the allegation 5 Q. made by Mr. Crooks, correct? 6 No, actually what we went, the original was that it 7 Α. was -- are you talking about the original arrest? 8 Well, when you go out -- I'm sorry, let me back 9 Q. up. On the date that you go out and meet with Mr. 10 Crooks? 11 Yes. 12 Α. That's in response to a complaint that has been 13 Q. 14 filed by Mr. Crooks? 15 Yes. Α. 16 Q. Okay. 17 And as part of that you were leery or at least observant regarding the presence of any 18 19 firearm, correct, sir? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Q. Okay. 22 Now what happened then you found no firearm, did you, sir? 23 24 No, we did not. Α. 25 Q. Okay.

No shot gun, no 40 caliber semi anything 1 like that, right, sir? 2 3 Α. No. Ο. Okay. 4 5 When you go out there, I mean this a high crime area, correct, sir? 6 7 Α. Very much so. Mr. Crooks appears to live in that neighborhood, 8 Q. 9 right? Well, yeah, he frequents that area. I've seen him 10 Α. there before. 11 Okay, sure you said, yeah, right as part of an 12 Q. officer you've seen him there before. Okay. 13 Were you aware that Mr. Crooks had been 14 questioned three times by detectives with regard to 15 16 the homicide in September, were you aware of that 17 at the time you went out? 18 Α. No, I was not. 19 Q. Okay. And it would be obvious here that -- I 20 mean, you're in plain clothes, right, sir? 21 22 Α. Yes. You and your partner. And I assume that means not 23 Q. only would you have a blue uniform with a badge on, 24 25 but you wouldn't be dressed the way you and I are

today either, correct? 1 No. 2 Α. You're wearing more blue jeans, a sweat shirt a 3 Q. jacket, that type of thing? 4 5 Α. Yes. You want to mix in, right? 6 Q. 7 Α. Yes. You want to be inconspicuous, correct? 8 Q. Yes. 9 Α. 10 ο. Okay. And Mr. Houston you indicated fled into 11 that location, okay, once you and your partner 12 Officer Oliva Moss attempt to approach him, right? 13 Yes. 14 Α. And what happens when this all occurs, your attempt 15 Q. to approach Mr. Houston occurs after Mr. Crooks and 16 Mr. Houston have exchanged words, right? 17 Α. Yes. 18 Okay, fairly loud aggressive words, right? 19 Ο. 20 Α. Yes. Including Mr. Crooks saying basically there's that 21 Q. MF right there, right? 22 Yes. 23 Α. And at that point would it be fair to say that you 24 Q. 25 and your partner start moving over rapidly,

correct? 1 Correct. 2 Α. MR. LANKFORD: Okay, nothing else. 3 THE COURT: Redirect? 4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. HASSINGER: 6 7 And when you're approaching Mr. Houston rapidly Q. because you're in plain clothes, what are you 8 9 doing? Pull my badge so that he could see it, and also I 10 stated that I was the Detroit Police. 11 And did you say it just like you said it here in 12 Q. court today I'm Detroit Police? 13 No, I did not. I said it very loud so that he 14 Α. would hear me very clearly. 15 16 Q. And that was being said during the course of this 17 entire search? Very much so. 18 Α. MR. HASSINGER: Thank you. Thank you, 19 Judge. 20 THE COURT: Re-cross, limit to what was 21 22 brought out on redirect only. MR. LANKFORD: Sure. 23 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION** 24 25 BY MR. LANKFORD:

1	Q.	But the badge is just, I mean, it's just hanging
2		down from your neck on a cord, right?
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	And you have I mean, you are aware of a some
5		things such as false identifications, I'm a police
6		officer when I'm not, right, sir?
7	Α.	Correct.
8		MR. LANKFORD: Okay, thank you, nothing
9		else.
10		THE COURT: One last question, Your Honor.
11		THE COURT: Well, all right, then I have
12		to give him another opportunity.
13		MR. HASSINGER: I understand, Judge, I'm
14		sorry.
15		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
16	ву м	R. HASSINGER:
17	Q.	Other officers come to this scene?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	Are they in full uniform?
20	A.	Yes, they are.
21	Q.	Are there marked scout cars out there on the
22		street?
23	Α.	Yes, there is.
24		MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Judge.
25		THE COURT: Okay, go ahead, counsel
ı	I	

RECROSS-EXAMINATION 1 2 BY MR. LANKFORD: All of that happens after Mr. Houston has gone 3 Ο. inside of that location, right, sir? 4 5 Α. Yes. MR. LANKFORD: Okay, nothing else. 6 7 you. THE COURT: We thank and excuse the 8 You're free to go. Are you ready to call 9 witness. your next witness? 10 MR. HASSINGER: Yes, Judge. Actually, 11 Judge, defense counsel and I would like to do with 12 the court's permission is to enter into a stipulation 13 at this time. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. MR. HASSINGER: Judge, that stipulation 16 17 would be that on September 6th of last year, 2002 the Defendant, Michon Houston was ineligible to 18 possess or use or carry a firearm because he had 19 20 been convicted of a specified felony punishable by imprisonment for four more years and the requirements 21 for gaining eligibility had not been met. 22 MR. LANKFORD: Agreed, Your Honor. 23 24 THE COURT: All right. MR. HASSINGER: Judge, and at this time 25

1	the People would move to waive several endorsed
2	witnesses from the People's witness list.
3	THE COURT: Go ahead.
4	MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Judge. We'd
5	like to waive and thank and excuse police officer
6	Fred Mcintyre.
7	THE COURT: Do you agree to that waiver?
8	MR. LANKFORD: I do, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Accumulative testimony,
10	is that it?
11	MR. LANKFORD: Absolutely.
12	MR. HASSINGER: Exactly, Judge. He was
13	the partner of Officer Williams who testified this
14	morning.
15	We'd like to thank, waive and excuse
16	police Officer Daniel Sitarski. He was the partner
17	of the officer who conveyed the clothing.
18	MR. LANKFORD: Bastianelli.
19	MR. HASSINGER: Bastianelli, correct, so
20	he would accumulative.
21	THE COURT: All right.
22	MR. LANKFORD: Agreed.
23	MR. HASSINGER: We'd like to waive
24	Investigator Olson from Detroit Homicide. He
25	simply would say he took statements from certain
ļ	

1	witnesses.
2	MR. LANKFORD: Agreed.
3	THE COURT: All right.
4	MR. HASSINGER: We'd like to waive
5	Christina Eshelman who's endorsed on the witness
6	list, Judge.
7	MR. LANKFORD: Agreed, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: She was the partner of someone
9	or you're just waiving?
10	MR. HASSINGER: No, she's a civilian,
11	Judge.
12	THE COURT: Oh, that's a civilian and
13	you've agreed to that?
14	MR. LANKFORD: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Accumulative testimony, all
16	right.
17	MR. HASSINGER: And finally, Judge, we've
18	endorsed a representative of Third Circuit Court
19	and also Lisa Westwood, but the stipulation that we
20	just entered into negates the need to call those
21	witnesses, Judge.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. LANKFORD: I'd agree, Your Honor.
24	MR. HASSINGER: And then finally, Your
25	Honor, we just heard from Officer Charles Adams.

1	His partner is Oliva Moss. She's present, but
2	again I believe the testimony you would hear from
3	her would be identical to what Officer Adams just
4	testified to. The People would move to waive
5	Officer Moss.
6	MR. LANKFORD: No objection. I agree with
7	that statement.
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	MR. HASSINGER: Finally, Judge, the
10	officer in charge is endorsed. He's present. The
11	People would move to waive him from the People's
12	case.
13	THE COURT: Because he'd have nothing to
14	add?
15	MR. HASSINGER: Basically, Judge, that's
16	correct.
17	THE COURT: Okay, all right, and there's
18	no objection.
19	MR. LANKFORD: Correct.
20	MR. HASSINGER: Judge, unless I missed
21	anybody on the witness list, I do not believe I
22	have the People have exhausted their witnesses
23	that are endorsed and the People would rest.
24	THE COURT: Okay, and because I also have
25	Exhibits Number One through have been admitted into

evidence, right? 1 MR. HASSINGER: That was my understanding, 2 I did want to make sure that the Court was 3 agreeing with me on that. 4 THE COURT: Right. Okay. At this time we 5 will let our jurors because there some people who 6 were able to get here at 9:00. Why don't we let 7 them take a coffee break because there's some 8 matters we can take care of and then I think we'll 9 be hearing the conclusion of this case. 10 We'll rise for you to take a 20 minute 11 coffee break. Please, be outside to the courtroom 12 door at ten minutes to the hour by that clock. 13 THE CLERK: All rise. 14 (Jury exits courtroom) 15 THE COURT: I can't see any motion to make 16 17 at this point either. MR. LANKFORD: Right, you know, I would 18 however like to make a record. Two quick things. 19 THE COURT: Go ahead. 20 MR. LANKFORD: The first one is --21 THE COURT: And that's right, you better 22 23 get your officer in charge back here. Go ahead, You're not going to need him for this? 24 thought it was about the witness that you asked 25

them to get. 1 MR. LANKFORD: I'll make a record with 2 regards to that. And I'd like to voir dire 3 Mr. Houston, if I may. 4 THE COURT: Okay, we'll wait until he gets 5 the officer because you're going to need him. 6 MR. LANKFORD: Okay. 7 THE COURT: All right, counsel, go ahead 8 first of all and voir dire your client if that's 9 what you wanted to do. 10 MR. LANKFORD: Thank you. 11 Mr. Houston, if you stand please, sir. 12 Sir, do you understand that the People now have 13 rested; in other words their case is done in its 14 entirety as far as any production of witnesses or 15 evidence? 16 DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Yes. 17 MR. LANKFORD: And I explained to you that 18 at this point we would have the opportunity to call 19 any witnesses on our behalf if we wanted too, 20 right? 21 DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Yes. 22 MR. LANKFORD: And I explained to you 23 specifically that you have the right to take the 24 stand and testify on your own behalf, correct? 25

1	DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Right.
2	MR. LANKFORD: The absolute right to do
3	that?
4	DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Right.
5	MR. LANKFORD: And in addition, you have
6	the absolute right not to take the stand if you so
7	desire, right?
8	DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Right.
9	MR. LANKFORD: If you take the stand, sir,
10	you'd be subject to cross-examination on the same
11	standards regarding credibility as any other
12	witness?
13	DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Right.
14	MR. LANKFORD: If, however, you elected
15	not to take the stand, this Judge would specifically
16	inform the jury that they may not hold that against
17	you in any way; do you understand all of that?
18	DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Yes.
19	MR. LANKFORD: In addition, we have
20	discussed some of the proofs that have come out
21	during the course of this testimony?
22	DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Yes.
23	MR. LANKFORD: And you've been satisfied
24	with the discussion that we've had?
25	DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Right.

MR. LANKFORD: And you have indicated to 1 me earlier today that your choice was not to take 2 the stand; is that correct? 3 DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Right. 4 MR. LANKFORD: Okay. 5 THE COURT: And that is still your choice 6 7 not to testify? DEFENDANT HOUSTON: Yes, yes. 8 THE COURT: Okay, very good. He may be 9 seated. 10 MR. LANKFORD: Thank you. 11 THE COURT: All right, now, you did have a 12 witness you tried to get -- go ahead. 13 MR. LANKFORD: Yes, just briefly as the 14 court's well aware of, there had been an order for 15 assistance beyond a subpoena subsequent to actually 16 they were going to get a bench warrant. That was 17 issued on Thursday. I know we were here Friday. 18 did talk with Sergeant Marshall, they've been 19 unable to procure that witness. They have as I 20 understand that they continued to look over the 21 weekend. 22 Still have not procured her. I do think 23 24 she is valuable to the defense. I quess I'm not 25 sure -- I guess, I don't know whether additional

time would assist in procuring that person or not, and I have no reason to believe that there hasn't been a diligent effort, but I would ask that those efforts continue.

THE COURT: Well, counsel, I will say that the one thing that I thought about on Friday as I stood in the hospital calling back here to find out was whether they got the witness and I was informed they didn't. I said, well, great tell them they got the whole weekend.

So it was really like you had the adjournment to get the witness. I don't think any additional time is going to be -- because as I understand it as an officer of the court, I heard from the prosecutor that she gave a false name.

MR. HASSINGER: Judge, that's absolutely correct. Sergeant Marshall, in fact, called me at my home last night. They've been making efforts all weekend, but what they did find out from going back to that location is that from talking to other witnesses there that, in fact, the witness gave a false name when she gave a statement to the police. And we have no way to even determining what her true identity is.

Sergeant Marshall is here if we need take testimony to that fact, but that is what he has conveyed to me. And I know they were out there all weekend trying to find that witness.

THE COURT: I will also say this because
I had to issue a detainer, witness detainer for two
of the main witnesses in this case. And I think I
did that one day and the very next day you had all
of those persons here, so I know that they have
been trying very hard to get all of the witnesses
here.

Unless counsel is going to demand, I'm going to take your word as an officer of the court that they have determined this woman gave a false name and we have no place to go with it.

MR. LANKFORD: And I will, I mean I feel
I had to make the request on behalf of Mr. Houston
as his attorney. But I also am aware of the fact
that I have no reason to disbelieve that they tried
their best. I also do note that they weren't able
to find Ms. Watson who may have been helpful.

Apparently, they were making the same type of efforts with regards to Ms. Eshelman who could have been helpful to the prosecution.

THE COURT: And they didn't find her

either. 1 MR. LANKFORD: And they didn't find her. 2 MR. HASSINGER: That's correct, Judge. 3 THE COURT: All right, okay. Then are you 4 going to put in any evidence? 5 MR. LANKFORD: No. Defense will rest 6 formally. 7 THE COURT: I pulled the following 8 instructions. Have seats. I intend to give these 9 and, of course, if you make proper objections I'll 10 omit any. If you make a proper request, I'll 11 include any others. 12 We're going to give Judge and Jury, 13 Presumption of Innocence, Burden of Proof, 14 Reasonable Doubt, Defendant Not Testifying, 15 Evidence, Weighing Conflicting Evidence, Number of 16 Witnesses, Circumstantial Evidence, Motive, 17 Stipulation, Flight, Witness Credibility, Witness 18 Who Has Been Interviewed By a Lawyer, Expert 19 Witness, Police Witness, Impeachment Brought By 20 Prior Inconsistent Statements. And that was both 21 Mr. -- well, wait a minute, I got to go back. 22 I remember you're asking him about things 23 that they did not say which you can argue in their 24 statements, they didn't put in their statement. 25

But I'm going back, I don't see any actual 1 impeachment of either Jovan Johnson and Lavero 2 Let me get to their testimony. 3 Crooks. Lavero Crooks, I don't have anything. 4 MR. LANKFORD: I'd agree with Mr. Crooks. 5 THE COURT: I don't have anything on Jovan 6 7 Johnson. MR. LANKFORD: Your Honor, Mr. Johnson 8 did -- there was one off a preliminary exam 9 transcript with regards to what he felt he may have 10 been charged with. 11 THE COURT: Oh, okay, Jovan Johnson. 12 MR. LANKFORD: So I agree with regards to 13 Crooks that there some things that weren't included, 14 but Johnson was different at least as to that. 15 THE COURT: Okay, let me put that down. 16 And that was from the preliminary examination, so, 17 I will however if the witness testified that the 18 earlier statement was true or if the earlier 19 inconsistent was given under oath subject to the 20 penalty of perjury at a trial or hearing it may be 21 considered as proof of the facts in this case. 22 MR. LANKFORD: Thank you. 23 THE COURT: First Degree Premeditated 24 Murder, Specific Intent, Felon Possessing a 25

1	
1	Firearm, Possession of a Firearm at the Commission
2	or Attempt to Commit a Felony, Deliberations and
3	Verdict, Communications with the Court, Penalty,
4	Exhibits.
5	Now, I assume that you're also going to
6	want something more on Inferring and Intent.
7	MR. HASSINGER: Yes, Judge.
8	THE COURT: Other than Inferring, State of
9	Mind, is there anything else?
10	MR. HASSINGER: No, that's the one that
11	the People request, Your Honor.
12	MR. LANKFORD: Your Honor, with regards
13	to
14	THE COURT: Hold on one moment.
15	MR. LANKFORD: Okay.
16	THE COURT: I keep telling you I can only
17	do one thing at a time. All right.
18	MR. LANKFORD: Judge, one last thing not
19	that I would be arguing second degree murder. I
20	know that for years that had to be given even if I
21	objected. Last year they came up with a case, it's
22	just muddied the water to say the least. I read
23	and reread it and quite frankly still can't make
24	heads or tails.
25	THE COURT: I can't figure it out either.

But I want to hear what the People have to say.

Are you going to object to my giving Second Degree

Murder?

MR. HASSINGER: No.

THE COURT: Then I'm going to give it
because I still don't understand about that opinion
and it seems to me that I'm seeing weirder and
weirder opinions coming out of the Court of Appeals
because I've gotten a slue of unpublished opinions
that say that probation violations are not subject
to the guidelines.

And I have a lawyer who did an appeal and he has an opinion from the Court of Appeals that says that they are subject to the guidelines.

Now, apparently nobody up there at the Court of Appeals has recognized that there is at least a conflict among the panel because nobody certified it, so I don't know what's going on with them anymore. So I'm going to give second degree murder.

MR. LANKFORD: If I can I guess it's just a little editorializing. They took what appeared to have been a perfectly workable rule for years on lessors, I got no idea what they're doing.

THE COURT: I agree. Okay, anything

1 else? MR. LANKFORD: No, I think the court has 2 covered it from defense prospective. Thank you. 3 MR. HASSINGER: And also from the 4 People's, Judge. 5 THE COURT: Okay. We'll start again in 6 ten minutes -- well, we're going to give court 7 reporter and I a couple minutes more than that, so 8 let's make it and you be ready at 11:00 to do your 9 10 openings. Okay, 11:00 o'clock. 11 (Court is in recess.) 12 (Court reconvenes.) 13 (Jury enters courtroom.) 14 THE COURT: You may be seated. May I have 15 a stipulation that all of our jurors are here and in their proper places? 16 17 MR. HASSINGER: So stipulate, Your Honor. 18 MR. LANKFORD: Yes, we do. THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm 19 20 going to remind you may not discuss this case among 21 yourselves nor with anyone until I send you to the jury room after you've had your final instructions 22 and tell you to begin discussing this case. Don't 23 24 discuss this case at all until that time. 25 Does the defense wish to put in any

evidence?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LANKFORD: No, Your Honor, defense rests.

THE COURT: Are the People ready to proceed with closing?

MR. HASSINGER: Ready, Judge.

THE COURT: You may.

MR. HASSINGER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. As the Judge just indicated to you, this is my opportunity to give my closing statement to you. Before I do that I'd like to thank each and every one of you for being down here, being prompt in this horrible weather to try and get down here today. You're all here. You're ready to go. You've been paying attention to this I've been watching you. I know you have been trying your best to listen to the evidence and understand what's going on here and I appreciate I appreciate that on behalf of the People of the State of Michigan, who I represent. I appreciate that on behalf of the family of Carlton Thomas. They appreciate the fact that you're all here. even Mr. Houston appreciates it, so we all thank you for being here. For taking the time out your lives to be jurors in this case.

Like I told you in my opening statement, we all have things we'd rather be doing these last three days we've been together so, and on behalf of the officer in charge Sergeant Marshall, he thanks you also. A lot of work and effort had gone into this case. So thank you very much for being here.

Again, I want to talk to you a little bit about evidence and charges, and then get into the actual facts of the case. The evidence in this case is the testimony you heard from witnesses. The Judge is going to tell you that attorney's questions are not evidence. Our statements to you are not evidence. The evidence is the testimony you heard from the witness.

The other evidence you have that's been introduced is our diagram that the medical examiner testified to. Our sketch of scene. And then we have seven pictures that were admitted into evidence. So you got nine pieces of evidence along with the testimony you heard from witness stand.

And your job is to put all of that together and then to tell us with your verdict what happened back on September 6th of last year.

Carlton Thomas was shot four times and died as a result of those gun shots wounds.

2.2

Somebody committed a cold blooded first degree murder. There's no doubt about it. No doubt about the fact that Mr. Thomas is now dead. Somebody shot him four times for no reason. There was no reason to kill Mr. Thomas. What was his big crime.

Well, okay, he was going over there

Well, okay, he was going over there to buy some cocaine. But that doesn't give anyone the right to be his judge, jury, and executioner like Mr. Houston that day.

This man was his judge, jury, and executioner. Why. Because Mr. Thomas didn't want to buy his cocaine from Mr. Houston. That's why he lost his life back on that day. Laying in that field.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I told you right from the beginning I said this case is about drugs, it's about drug dealers, its about guns, it's about violence, and it's about that whole underworld that unfortunately is going on, on a daily basis over there on west Buena Vista and Linwood. Okay.

You heard from the officers who patrol that scene regularly. This is life in that neighborhood. This is what the people who live in that neighborhood have to put up with on a daily

1.4

basis. And I told you right from the get go when a crime like this occurs, the witnesses to this crime are going to be the same type of people who are caught up in that environment.

Who did we have in this particular case.

JW, Jovan Johnson, County, Lavero Crooks. And they
both got up on the stand and they admitted to you,
they didn't lie about it. They admitted to you,
yeah, they're over there grinding on a daily
basis. What does grinding mean, they're out there
dealing drugs.

They get up there and they admit that they're doing that on a daily basis. And all the grinders out there know each other. They've got a code of honor basically. You heard it from these witnesses. You know, they got a code. They don't tell on each other. They look out for each other.

In fact, Jovan Johnson told you, hey, there's enough business for all of us. We can all make a living out here grinding. There's no reason to be going after one another. There's plenty of business for all of us out here.

They don't fight over customers. They tell you there were customers coming up and down that street all the morning of September 6th,

2002. They're all businessmen basically. They're businessmen conducting their business over there on west Buena Vista. They all know each other. And they all know if you start talking to other people and telling on people that you're not going to be able to conduct your business over there on west Buena Vista.

So you got to sort of get in that type of mind set. You have to sort of put yourself in the shoes of these people who are out there conducting their business and how they go about it. And why they do what they do.

You have to use your common sense and your reasoning. Okay. And I know none of you are caught up in this life-style or this type of circle of violence, but you have to think a moment like people do when they are out there.

So let's go back to September 6th. Let's talk a little bit about what happened. Carlton

Thomas comes walking through the field. And again, everybody knows anyone who comes to that neighborhood is there to buy drugs. Both Jovan Johnson and Mr. Houston yelled to him from the porch they're up on. Say, what's up. What do you need. What do you want. Mr. Houston runs over to

1.7

him and he has a conversation with Mr. Thomas.

And Mr. Thomas tells him, I don't want to deal with you. I'll spend my money the way I want to spend my money. And that enrages Mr. Houston. This is his neighborhood. He doesn't want to be turned down. And what does he do, he goes and gets his gun. And he fires one shot from a distance at Mr. Thomas.

And I put forward all the evidence in this case especially what you heard from the medical examiner that first shot from a distance is the shot that hit Mr. Thomas in the head. Mr. Thomas was perhaps running towards these trees from this trail.

Okay. He's running perhaps in this direction. A shot is fired from this direction. It hits him here. Exits. Then has another entrance right here. The medical examiner told you that was consistent with what he saw on Mr. Thomas when he examined him.

Mr. Thomas falls. And, in fact, he falls where that blood is on the map, on our diagram. You know that because Mr. Crooks tells you he falls face first. And that's going to be important.

Okay. All these little things are going to be

They're all going to add up. important. 1 He falls face forward, and that's how we 2 get this blood out there that the evidence tech 3 takes a picture of, and it's admitted into 4 evidence. 5 Mr. Crooks then tells you that Mr. 6 Houston goes up to him, flips the body over, okay, 7 so the body's going to be a foot, foot and a half 8 away from the blood now. Stands over him and 9 shoots him at least three more times. 10 And the medical examiner told you that 11 those other three shots, the shot to the leg below 12 the knee, and gun shot wounds two and three were 13 consistent with somebody standing above you and 14 shooting. It all fits together. It all makes 15 16 sense. Mr. Houston comes up after he shot him 17 the first time, turns him over, and shoots him 18 three more times. Standing above. 19 20 (Disruption in courtroom) THE COURT: You'll have to leave the 21 22 courtroom. MR. HASSINGER: Mr. Houston goes back 23 across the street to JW, Jovan Johnson. Tells him 24 go back over and see if he's dead. Jovan Johnson 25

doesn't want to do it. Some words are exchanged.

Jovan Johnson does it. He goes back over there Mr.

Thomas is still alive at that point but Mr. Johnson goes back and says he's dead, he's dead, and that's when they leave the scene.

Mr. Crooks who's seated in a car about this location. He's on the other side of the debris pile. He's sitting out rolling too. He observes all this from right here in this location. You can see the porch over here. There's a street light here. He can see what's going on right here. And, in fact, there's a very good picture of exactly what his line-of-sight would be.

Just for the record and for you people, that picture is Exhibit Number 4, because Exhibit Number four shows the debris pile. You can see a police car that's parked a little bit west of debris pile. You can see what Mr. Crooks' line-of-sight would have been.

That's exactly his view. He can see everything that's happening. He can hear the words that are being spoken because he's out there rolling too.

In fact, Mr. Crooks sees that when the

defendant gets -- excuse me, when Mr. Thomas gets rolled over that Mr. Houston goes through his pockets and takes his money. That's important too. Okay. Mr. Houston takes his money.

That's what happened back on September 6 of last year when Mr. Thomas lost his life. This is the man responsible. Right here. And I'm asking you to hold him accountable for what he did. None of us made him do anything. Hold him accountable for his actions. That's what I'm asking you to do. I'm asking you to come back and find him guilty of first degree murder.

This is premeditated, deliberate killing of another human being. He shot him not once. He reflects about what he wants to do. He goes over to Mr. Thomas, he turns him over, he stands over him thinks about what he wants to do and he puts three more rounds in him. That's first degree premeditated deliberate willful killing of another human being without justification or excuse. No good reason.

Senseless. It's ridiculous.

The evidence in this case from all the witnesses is that Mr. Houston is the man who pulled the trigger.

Now, I'm not asking you to like Lavero

1.

Crooks and Jovan Johnson. But I'm asking you to believe them based on their testimony and all the evidence in this case. Just because they're drug dealers doesn't mean they're liars. If they wanted to lie are they going to get up on the stand and admit their drug dealers. Doesn't make any sense.

Why would they lie to set up Mr.

Houston. I guess that's the real issue in this
case because Mr. Lankford's going to get up and
address you. And he's basically going to imply to
you that these witnesses that are coming in here
and perjuring themselves to setup Mr. Houston on
something he didn't do. Okay. Now, why would they
do this. What's the argument.

Well, Mr. Crooks waits two months before he reports this. Okay. And why does he report it. He told you why he reported it. Because Mr. Houston started to come after him. And he told you from the witness stand that he realized that when Mr. Houston started to come after him, it was either going to be him or Mr. Houston. One of them was going to have to die.

He chose a third option. He decided, well, at this point I'll get the police involved because he didn't want to have to kill Mr. Houston,

and he certainly didn't want Mr. Houston killing him.

Now, does that make sense. Is that enough reason to break the code of west Buena Vista and Linwood. I put forward it's probably about the only reason for breaking the code, because you're going to lose your life unless you break the code. They're all making good money over there. They're all conducting their business over there. The only reason you break the code is if you're going to lose your life.

Mr. Johnson is slightly different though because Mr. Johnson gets locked up in the county and at this time when he's in the County locked up on his dope case, on his drug case, the police have already talked to Lavero Crooks. And Lavero Crooks have already told the police who else was out there. Jovan Johnson was out there. So the police know from Lavero Crooks that Mr. Johnson is a witness.

So what do they do. They get him out of the county jail and sit down and talked with him and they tell him we know you were there. You're either a defendant or you're a witness. What do you want to be.

1.8

And that's when Mr. Johnson begrudgingly also breaks the code because he's afraid that the police might be looking at him if he doesn't cooperate and tell the truth about who killed Carlton Thomas. That's why he breaks the code.

He's caught. The police know he's there. They're confronting him with the facts and he rolls on his friend Mr. Houston. Remember, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Houston and Mr. Houston's girlfriend they went to the motorcycle club. They have been drinking. These are the guys that he hangs out with. These are his friends. But Mr. Johnson had to overcome his friendship. He told you, I didn't want any part of this case. This is my friend. I don't want to come in and testify.

He's here to testify on his friend and he tells you who pulls the trigger. His friend Mr.

Michon Houston is the trigger man. That's what you folks have to deal with. That's why I told you up front, these people are drug dealers. You won't like them, but they're telling the truth. Based on all evidence you know they are.

How in the world would Mr. Crooks know the victim was shot in the face unless he was

there. He can't just guess and make that up. How would he know that there would be this spot of blood and then the body had been rolled over. How would he know that unless he was there.

Is there any other evidence that was put before you to explain how he would know all the circumstances of this crime unless he was there and witnessed it. There is none. There's no other explanation. None. The explanation is he was there and he witnessed the crime.

Now, Mr. Lankford's going to get up and tell you tell you, yeah, but there's differences between what Mr. Johnson told you and what Mr. Crooks told you. And there are. There's about three significant differences and we're going to go through those.

But the question is does that mean Mr. Thomas wasn't murdered. Does that mean Mr. Houston didn't shoot him because there's some differences between Mr. Crooks and Mr. Johnson's testimony. We still have somebody who's been murdered, ladies and gentlemen. And the thing is their testimony is consistent about is who pulled the trigger, and that's really the only issue in this case. Who pulled the trigger. We know somebody was murdered.

The only question is who pulled that trigger.

Now, why are there differences between the testimony of Mr. Crooks and Mr. Johnson. I think you can figure out from the record that Mr. Johnson, even though he's telling you who the shooter is still doesn't want to really add in every little detail because he's trying to protect his friend to a certain extent. All right.

It's worse if he says that Mr. Houston turned the victim over and shot him some more and took his money. That's how Mr. Johnson thinks.

That's the way his mind works. It's worse to have to give up all those other details that Mr. Houston had to run and get a gun. Okay. It makes Mr.

Michon Houston's actions seem even more egregious, even more severe.

So yeah, there are some slight differences in the testimony. There are in every case. The Judge is going to give you an instruction, in fact. The Judge is going to tell you that people see and hear and remember things differently. Okay.

You might be at the same event with another person and they might remember it slightly differently than you. That doesn't mean they're

lying. The Judge is going to tell you that.
That's the way the human mind works.

You can accept or reject anything a witness tells you from that witness stand if it doesn't agree with the other facts and evidence in this case. The issue in this case is very narrow and very limited. Who pulled the trigger. There is Mr. Michon Houston. He's the man who pulled the trigger, so he's guilty and he's guilty of First Degree Premeditated Murder. That's what he did to Mr. Thomas.

But he's also guilty of two more counts. He's guilty of being a felon in possession of a firearm for shooting Mr. Thomas. He's also guilty of what's called felony firearm. That's for possessing a weapon when you commit a crime. Those two counts are easy. Obviously you've heard the evidence from the medical examiner Mr. Thomas was shot. Okay. Whoever did this had a firearm. So those two counts are easy.

When I made my opening statement on Thursday I told you what I believed the evidence would be and what you'd hear from that witness stand. Quite frankly I think it came out pretty much exactly like I told you it would come out.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm asking you to consider all the evidence in this particular case, to come back with three counts of guilty as charged, because that's the right thing to do, because that's what happened, and Mr. Houston should be held accountable for his actions.

We had two eye witnesses to this crime who came in here, raised their hand, swore to tell the truth about who killed Mr. Thomas. And they got up there on the stand and I asked both of them, the last question I asked both of them is, now are you coming in here and committing perjury. They told you no. They're not doing that.

These people told you the truth. They're honest. They admitted they're out there grinding all day long, selling drugs out there on west Buena Vista. There's a code they live by, and they told you why they violated the code.

Ladies and gentlemen, come back with one Count of First Degree Premeditated Murder. One Count of Felon in Possession of a Firearm, and one Count of Felony Firearm.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Defense closing.

MR. LANKFORD: Thank you.

Good morning once again, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Murder cases are always extremely difficult even for people that routinely deal with it, because you have a person who's dead. The more serious thing you can do to a person. There's a natural inclination to want to make somebody pay for that mistake. Logically it's understandable.

But what has come in the last few days in this case when you start with the presumption of innocence and burden of proof and if that's beyond a reasonable doubt, they don't have a case.

Something that keeps going through my mind over and over in this case. And during the course of this is why, why is Mr. Houston a better suspect than Mr. Johnson or Mr. Crooks, because they say so. I'm talking about they say. You know there's a code out there. The code is called look out for number one. Always, first and foremost, you look out for number one. Everybody else can take care of themselves. That's the code.

The alleged code you see on old movies, maybe they existed when I was a teenager. And now, look out for number one. That's the code.

You know, starting off I'm going to try

and keep it organized. I get nervous when I start seeing circumstances that either unexplained or poorly explained because then I start thinking that's not a coincidence. Okay. That's something intentional. If it's a coincidence, so be it, but this isn't.

There was some testimony here that I think was a coincidence with a quotation mark.

Random chance happens. When it crosses the line, it's not coincidence anymore, it is people getting together.

Now, let's talk about in essence you have two people coming in and saying the exact same thing. Okay. Mr. Houston shot him. All right.

Nothing I can do about two people who came in. I want to talk about what I think about their testimony. And remember a couple of things, number one, I do not have to prove that Mr. Houston is not guilty. They have to prove that he is.

Number two, I don't have to prove who did it. Quite frankly, that's beyond my limited capabilities. I mean we use some things in here, some thoughts that I think are perfectly logical, but I don't have to prove who did it. That's not my job and I am not able to do that.

You know, sometimes pictures can be worth a thousand words. I think I'm going to refer to some of these during my closing. And some of them I think make it clear if you would look at the photographs. Okay. Some of the things that I'm saying absolutely have to be correct. Even though I wasn't out there five days out of six, they have to be because those pictures show some of what I'm saying has to be correct.

Now, we do know that does it takes two

Now, we do know that does it takes two months for anybody to decide that, yeah, we need to tell the police about this. And let's look first that neither make any mention of this for two months. Eight to 10 weeks. Okay. And those coincidences that I'm talking about -- oh, in fact, both specifically deny it for two months.

One guy, Jovan Johnson, denies it. He's standing in the apartment building at Lee's place within a week, every opportunity, the police are there, every single opportunity, and he says I don't know nothing about nothing.

For two months being questioned three times Lavero Crooks says absolutely nothing. What are the circumstances, one of those little coincidences that bother me. What are circumstances

1.0

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

12

14

21

22

23

24

25

under which they both come forward. conscious gets to them. Well, it just happened that the one guy Jovan Johnson managed to get arrested on a drug charge. Okay. That coincidently that's when Lavero Crooks now comes forward. he gets arrested on a drug charge and he stands there over at county not knowing when he's going to get out, a number of bars, concrete, meals when they give them to you. Meals are what they give to you. No toilets. No seats on the toilets. are stainless steel. It's part of my job is I go in jail and police stations. I'm always real glad that they let me out at my request because these are not nice places.

And what do they say besides sitting there and going okay I'm on a little drug charge, you know they got to let me out now. Now, while I'm sitting there not knowing when I'm going to get out of this. Homicide. Homicide comes over, okay, I don't initiate anything. They start talking to They tell me what day of the week this shooting occurred. They happened to get it wrong, it wasn't a Saturday it was actually a Friday morning. But they tell me what day of the week it They tell me what happened. They gave a bunch of information if I don't then they say, now look,
your name keeps coming up. Okay. We got an
unsolved homicide. And right now you're looking at

who, but you are the number one suspect.

And what's the code on the streets, look out for number one first. And you're the one out on the line Mr. Johnson. You're the one that we're questioning. You're the one and we took the trouble when we learned you were in county on a nickel and dime drug charge to come over and see you. Mr. Johnson's sitting there thinking, drugs are bad enough, but I sure don't want a murder case. Let me give you a name. Why is Mr. Houston a better suspect, and those all happened at the same time.

Now, I think I covered some of Mr.

Johnson, his motive trying to get out from

underneath this charge. But the other thing is

even a motive and I'm trying to figure out here

what a person who has never done business with a

man, what his motive would be to shoot him. Well,

he didn't want to do business with him. Well, you

know, new customers are free to come and go when

they want, the last I thought. Okay.

But who knows, Mr. Thomas because he's

done business with him in the past. Who would 1 consider Mr. Thomas to be one of his customers. I 2 think Johnson. He told you that. I know the man. 3 I've done business with him on a number of 4 occasions. 5 Now I can understand if a person says 6 7 wait a minute you can't diss me like that. You can't tell your supplier that you want to go 8 elsewhere. Does that make sense. I mean, within 9 the context. But two strangers, it just doesn't 10 make sense. It doesn't add up. 11 12 You know, pictures, let me walk over here a second and start on some of this. First of all, 13 if I may remember Officer Melvin Williams he 14 15 strikes me as a very observant young officer. Okay. Remember that he says that you have to 16 17 drive, that he's coming in this direction, that he has to drive, that there's a clump of weeds right 18 somewhere in there that he has to drive beyond this 19 pile of debris because of it's obstructive --20 THE COURT: We can barely hear your voice. 21 22 MR. LANKFORD: Sorry. THE COURT: The court reporter does have 23 24 to take you down. 25 MR. LANKFORD: Yes, ma'am.

And he has to, Officer Williams has to cross beyond these two sets of obstructions before he can see clearly into the field. He's an observant young man. He's impede his view. It's getting light out. And he hasn't been drinking or smoking, one would presume, and that's when he sees it. That's when he sees it. He is incapable, he is unable to see this until he gets to this point. Okay. Which brings up the photographs. Please look at these. Exhibit Number Four, looking north in the field. I'm looking north onto Buena Vista from the field. It's real clear what Officer Williams did.

He came in the opposite direction from this car. He goes behind this garage with this clump of weeds. He passed beyond this debris. And he gets to a proximate location between the bike and the phone when he can now see into the field.

Okay, fine, that's when you can see it.

Now, this, okay. What else does this picture tell us. That these trees are in full foliage and at 5:00 o'clock in the morning in the dark with the light pole in front of you, not back dropping you, not back lighting you, looking into this dense brush according to Mr. Johnson, and this

is what you're able to clearly see from a location on a porch here with brick columns.

It's somewhat like sitting at the old

Tiger Stadium, you better enjoy the atmosphere

because you're not going to see a lot of the game.

That's where he says he is.

Now that angle, that angle appears to be almost the same angle as that of Mr. Crooks. And Mr. Crooks, if this angle is correct, Mr. Crooks would be sitting just about right here. He'd be between the two. Okay.

And, again, look at the clump of weeds and the debris. Mr. Crooks says that's where I was and I can see just fine. All right.

Again, Exhibits 4, 3 and 9, distances, angles, obstructions, look at them because these pictures tell a thousand words, ladies and gentlemen.

Now, we're going back, okay. So Mr.

Johnson has motive because he's getting nervous
that he may be looking at a homicide. He might
have a reason to actually, I don't know if you call
it motive, reason, motive and a reason, but he's
dissed by, did you do the shooting or it's a lie.
There it is in a nutshell.

it for two months. Okay.

So now we're going to bring Mr. Crooks in as corroboration. Well, quite frankly I don't think Lavero Crooks was ever there. How's he come up with this stuff. He's got two months to talk with guys in the hood. You know when people talk about

Well, how else could he know unless he was there, because he's got two months to talk.

And Lavero Crooks I don't believe was there because his testimony -- I mean, look, the both are saying the same thing in the same type of way that back in Puritan days people used to get together and say I saw Sally Smith dancing naked in the moonlight with the devil. All right. Yeah, they're consistent as far as that goes.

And I understand that people see and hear things differently, but I also know that details are important and realizing things are going different ways. For example, all right, Lavero and again keep in mind, take a look at that rise, take a look at that clump of weeds. Think about what you would have been able to see through it or around it, okay, which Officer Melvin Williams wasn't able to do, but maybe Lavero Crooks who's out there smoking a little weed, doing a sale,

maybe he's just got better vision. Maybe he's got better observation in the dark with obstruction, maybe he's superman, I don't know.

Anyway, he says though that he sees Mr. Houston go, leave, physically leave the field and get a gun from this abandoned house or this house which happens to where Lavero Crooks spent the night. Coincidence, don't you think. Along the same lines Jovan Johnson, no, I never saw anybody leave. All right. I never saw anybody leave.

Now, Javon says I heard a swearing, but I never heard anything racial. Lavero Crooks says, oh no, they were racial epitaphs, offensive words besides swearing going on.

And despite Jovan Johnson's testimony that well, I called out too, what do you need my friend. Sure, Lavero Crooks who's in it, if this is true Lavero if you were there and the windows were opened because it's a nice September morning and you're making sales, you're in a good position to hear and you don't hear that. You only hear what you want to hear. And I'm giving you the benefit of the doubt that you were even out there Lavero. Okay. You don't hear that.

And let me get this straight. Lavero

Crooks, Jovan Johnson know each another. I'm sitting in my car all night long, business is so good when people that I know show up a short distance away, I don't even acknowledge their existence. Jovan Johnson said I never saw Lavero Crooks or his car which I would recognize. Okay. Lavero Crooks apparently makes no attempt to eventhink about how strange that is.

Somebody you know, somebody who you are friends with, somebody you've been grinding together go who knows how long in the same neighborhood and you don't even at least, hey,

JW -- I mean, County, how you doing.

Lavero Crooks is attempting to corroborate something that he never saw.

Well, you know, Lavero, I came forward because problems with Mr. Houston and it involved a gun. And you know it's so easy low and behold, anybody seen a gun here. Nope. We got two diagrams, seven photos. That's it. No gun. Easy. He came after me with a gun.

And then again, folks, that is something that's going to be decided if necessary on top of that. But think about it in the context how easy it is. How easy it is. Okay.

1.3

homicide about the murder.

It seems to be always kind of the same thing. It's either my conscious started bothering me. Miracle of miracles, my conscious started bothering me the same time my buddy Jovan Johnson got picked up on a drug case and was talked to by

Or number two, pretty scared out there.

That's the other one that always comes out. I'm scared out there. Yeah, but every single opportunity that you had to talk with the police, when only the police were there, when nobody else was there, okay, you can't take advantage of it. All right.

Now think about it for a minute.

If that's true, all right, that I'm afraid, look then there's part of this I think about. If anybody sees me talking to the police, if anybody sees the police approach me, I'm in trouble. That's not what happened because that wasn't his problem. Okay.

Think about it for a second. Now I'm in danger if I say anything but the mere fact the police come up to me and talk to me on a regular basis, that doesn't endanger me. I'm sorry, but that's ridiculous. If this stuff went down the way they said it did, and he's afraid of Mr. Houston,

he is in danger merely because you got people in
the hood know that police called upon three occasions.

Okay.

They always one of the two things, either their conscious bothers them or somehow they get over the fear. It's always the same nonsense.

And with regards to Mr. Crooks, there's nothing any chasing. Nothing about any chasing. He says the first shot is fired from the porch. From the porch. Okay. Well, in and of itself this wound here in the face could be consistent with what Mr. Johnson says in and of itself.

But if that happened then we know we absolutely know that the first shot or shots would not have been fired from the porch. Okay. And quite frankly when you start adding it all up, what it says Lavero Crooks was not there on September 6th, that he is making it up. He is embellishing it.

Along those lines with regards to Mr.

Crooks I just want to say that when he finally talked to the police, two significant things that he seemed to leave out. Well, one, if you're with a young lady, did you ever tell the police that.

And number two, do you see, and the answers to that

is no. Okay. Number two, you see Mr. Houston supposedly flip him over and go through his pockets. Did you ever tell the please that. This is pretty significant here. He appeared robbing the guy and I got another witness. Okay. Did he ever tell the police either of those things. No, he did not. What's his excuse when he did was asked about, well, I wasn't asked.

Wait a minute, homicide detectives don't

Wait a minute, homicide detectives don't rush potential witnesses. Take your time. Here's my card if you remember anything from November until now, here's my card. Okay. Were well, he didn't ask me that. No, but sir, he gave you, the last question he asked you is do you have anything more you want to add. No, man, that's it.

It's not until he takes the stand and throws in a couple of other little nasty details. It's embellishing. He's lying. And these things from these guys I wouldn't perjure myself. These are just words. Words. Absolutely they're meaningless. You might as well be here reading some first year med school, bio, chem book. Perjury. Just words.

Where is the proof. What else have they got besides Lavero and Jovan. That's it. And I

don't want to beat a dead horse, but we're talking about how else would Lavero know. And let me give you a little scenario here. The guys grind there every day. Okay. And two months ago there's been a shooting.

Before that, the police show up and the reality is you can't -- I mean, it's almost like one of those little packs. You squeeze one end it gets bigger at the other. Okay. The police are there, but basically these guys are able to go about their business completely impeded or more or less impeded.

However, once there's been a shooting out there, everything changes. Now think about how good business has been. Guys are getting repeat customers at 5:00 o'clock in the morning. Business is so good that I'll sit in my car all night. It's that profitable. Okay. It is that good.

Now, once there's an unsolved homicide in that field around where everybody congregates, we got two problems. First of all, the Tenth Precinct is going to show up in uniforms on a regular basis. You can barely make a sale anymore before you see them cruising down Linwood.

It's going to attract attention in

precinct. In addition besides the uniform we have a whole another set of problems. We're going to have people in jackets and ties showing up on a regular basis questioning us. Do you think that conversation happened. Something along those lines did. Two months, they had two months to get this together.

And the fact that details are different indicates that one of them for sure wasn't out there.

Even if we say that the gun shot wound to the face is consistent with a hypothetical as given by Jovan Johnson but completely opposite that was given by Lavero Crooks, we have a couple of problems.

Consistent. Now he's laying on his back whether he got flipped over or not. Gun shot wound to the left knee consistent with that. Yes. Gun shot wound number two coming in the left flank going out the left flank at a slight angle. Yes.

And I realize that people will move at the last minute trying to save their life. Okay. When he's laying on his back explain coming in here, coming out here. Explain that. Boom, boom, what can we do with it. How do I position a gun to

do that. And you know, at some point up to 18 to 24 inches we have close-range firing. This is less than perfect because the clothes are still in the hospital. Okay. And fabrics can impede this soot, this gun powder gets imbedded.

But we do know that 18 to 24 inches where you will see this is just about the distance that Mr. Johnson said he told me to stop. That's the distance supposedly that these shots were fired from. No close-range firing.

The face, there's a hole. Okay. Jovan Johnson and Lavero Crooks got a real big interest in business resuming and things getting back to normal. That's not going to happen unless and until the police go away. Unless and until we give them something so they will go away.

A couple of others things that just wasn't mentioned. I apologize for the length.

Let's assume if Jovan Johnson is right. And I talked about the factor. Crooks can't be right.

He couldn't have seen it. It's different than what Jovan said, look, why he made it up basically is Lavero wasn't there.

I think I've gone over that ad nauseam.

I asked, let's go for JJ for a second, Jovan

Johnson. All right. If what he's saying is correct there's four to six shots fired at different times in the field.

Okay. Now, I understand when Officer

Carpenter goes out there that, you know, this is an unattended field, excuse me, Sergeant, and I understand that. Look at it, yeah, there's clumps of crabgrass. You wouldn't run out there because the grounds pretty uneven. But we're not talking about marshy cattails or elephant grass here.

Okay. You can clearly see the ground. You can clearly see the ground.

Officer Carpenter, the evidence tech goes out there, okay, and if what they're saying that Mr. Houston fired four to six rounds in the field, and according to Lavero Crooks it was a 40 caliber semiautomatic. I talked to the officer. What's the projection feature of a semi as opposed to a revolver. It kicks brass casing out.

All right, now, if this took place some where within ten or 12 feet, I would anticipate finding at least one brass casing. There's nothing. There's not one brass casing found in that field at all.

And Officer Carpenter is out there when

1.

it's daylight. Brass, even dull metal shines.

Okay. Shines. It will shine in the sunlight, and especially if you are closely looking for

something. If it's there you want to find it.

Now, okay, now I guess you kind of flip this both ways. Well, maybe it was a revolver. Yeah, but Lavero said it was a semi. Well, maybe -- and that revolver keeps the casings in tact. They keep them in the cylinder. Or maybe the shot was fired from across the street with a rifle. Okay. That's possible. And quite frankly I would give a person, even a trained military or law enforcement pretty good odds with a pistol, a handgun at 125 feet. My stupid luck. Very few, very few people are that good with a pistol or a revolver.

As far as bullets go, if they went on through is what it said. I don't expect Officer Carpenter to be down there on his hands and knees with a trenching tool, you know, doing the old gold dust kind of thing seeing if he can find any casings. I'm sorry, slugs. But there are no slugs recovered either. And I think that what happens is really if look at this and even according to Mr. Johnson's testimony Mr. Houston leaves. Okay,

1.3

there's no money, there's no ID. Coincidently there's no casings, there's no slugs.

I have a fairly good theory as to what happened. Somebody cleaned up. It can't be Mr. Houston. He's gone. If what you're saying is true Jovan. No casings, no slugs, no ID, no money. This person has no motive to shoot this man whatsoever. Who's left, and manages to get all this stuff that could be helpful, could corroborate. One of their civilians and it doesn't exist.

one second. All right. We do know too that Lavero and Jovan have been friends. Regardless of how they would like to put Mr. Houston's relationship as far as why they didn't come through before. This supposed code of the streets, the bottom line is they both said the same thing. They've known Mr. Houston for a couple of months. Not any particular time with him, really got nothing against him, he's been out there, he's been rolling with us for the last couple of months. That's it.

He is not their close friends. He is not somebody that they would care whether or not they try to help him out or do they try to harm him.

He's simply irrelevant to them. It's easy to do

that with somebody that's merely an acquaintance and not a threat.

Now, a couple of other things and I think I'm into the home stretch here. There's going to be stuff that when you guys go back into the jury room, things I haven't brought up enough. Maybe some of it will be helpful. Okay. I do want to ask you, people have the tendency to try to be amateur detectives and I think we all do that. The proofs here in this case are the proofs here. Either it's up or it's down. Theorizing, even saying to yourself maybe Mr. Houston was involved. That's all virtually by definition insufficient, it's virtually by definition not proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Everybody in this case has had a certain job. Shortly we're going to turn it over to you for what I believe is one of the most difficult jobs in this courtroom, and that is to make a decision regarding the facts. You are the persons who decide the facts and apply the law. That is your duty. Your obligation.

A couple of legal principals. When some of us first started in this business there was a jury instruction where they attempted to find proof

1.6

beyond a reasonable doubt. It's a somewhat difficult concept. But what they did about 10 or 12 years ago because they kind of flipped it and now there's a definition, a legal instruction which you must follow as to what reasonable doubt is.

And it goes through a lot of things and it comes down to that a reasonable doubt is just that, one that is reasonable under all the circumstances.

And I think that if you listen fairly to this, that there are reasonable doubts. There is a reasonable doubt. And I guess that definition of reasonable doubt sometimes maybe when I'm sitting in a bar having a couple of Heinkens and I can mumble things about academics, committees, people that never been in a courtroom, but the bottom line is that may well be one of the most brilliant things I've ever heard in my life. Okay. It's got a common sense to it. Ultimately a reasonable doubt is just that. One that is reasonable under the circumstances, and that's a legal definition.

Now, I do know two things about proof beyond a reasonable doubt. It's actually what you individually and collectively say it is. Okay.

I also know that proof beyond a reasonable

2.3

doubt is the highest standard that you can have in a courtroom in this country. It's not merely maybe or maybe a little more likely than not, it is proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, and I want to go through a couple of things here just basically legal principals the important ones in a criminal court. Okay.

First of all, folks, Mr. Houston is presumed to be innocent. He is not presumed to be guilty. He is presumed to be innocent.

Number two the burden of proof, it's right over here where it belongs, it doesn't cross this podium. It doesn't near Mr. Houston or myself. I don't have to prove anything. And as a result of the fact that the People have the burden of proof, they get two opportunities to talk with you guys. They get to talk with you first. I go second and then they're going to get a brief opportunity to talk with you once again.

And the reason that we let them go

primary and -- they say, memory experts what you

remember is what you read first and what you heard

last. But the reason that that is permitted for

him to go first and last is because he has the

burden of proof.

Finally, that burden of proof is, as I have talked about, beyond a reasonable doubt, not maybe, not might have been, not gee I think it's more likely than not. Their standard what they're held to is proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

When you apply those three most fundamental legal principals. When you seriously reflect upon the evidence or lack of evidence in this case, and I think that there's really only one fair and just verdict and that is it Mr. Houston is not guilty on all three counts.

On behalf of Mr. Houston, thank you for your time and your consideration.

THE COURT: Rebuttal.

MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

This is the last time I get to speak to you, ladies and gentlemen. And I'm going to be brief, I just want to make some comments about what Mr. Lankford has told you because I like Mr. Lankford. I've known him a long time and he's a good man. He's doing his job. We all appreciate that. But I do have disagreements about how he remembered the testimony and I'm hoping you can call upon your collective memory to remember what the testimony was.

1.6

For example, one example, when you heard 1 Officer Williams, he did testify that when he got 2 to about this area he was able to clearly see the 3 body in the field. Mr. Lankford is twisting that 4 around and arguing that Officer Williams could not 5 see the body from this location. And there's 6 absolutely no testimony to support that. 7 Officer Williams tells you when he makes 8 the observation from here, that does not mean it 9 was impossible for him to make the observation from 10 this location. That's not fair. 11 MR. LANKFORD: Judge, I object. He's 12 specifically said he did not make that observation. 13 THE COURT: Excuse me, I'll overrule the 14 objection. 15 MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: He's arguing what the evidence 1.7 18 tends to show. You may go ahead. MR. HASSINGER: Thank you, Judge. 19 So you can't say because a man sees 20 something from here, he could not have seen it from 21 And in fact we have the pictures. You can 22 look at the pictures. You can judge for yourself. 23 24 Okay. So you have to listen carefully to the 25

testimony because somebody says X that does not mean that Y is also true. And another coincidence I thought Mr. Lankford just got up here and he told you well Mr. Crooks and Mr. Johnson had to get rid of this murder investigation so they can get back out to grinding on west Buena Vista. Then why did they wait two months to come forward. If this investigation was hurting their business so bad, why did they wait two months.

See, this is a contradiction. It doesn't make sense where someone gets up here and argues two opposite things to you, and then you have to start wondering why they're doing this, and I'll answer that. Why they're doing this is to try and blow some smoke in front of your eyes so you don't see the real issue in this case. Because the real issue in this case. Because the real issue in this case is who shot Carlton Thomas.

It's not what words were spoken. Okay. The issue is who shot Carlton Thomas because, yes, I do have to prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt. But the judge, Judge Jones is going to tell you, the prosecutor has to prove the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. I don't have to prove how well the lighting was at that location. I don't have to prove other perhaps

inconsistencies about what was said and what was done, simply the elements of the crime, first degree murder. Somebody was killed.

Well, there's no doubt in this case somebody was killed. Somebody was killed deliberately and intentionally with premeditation as in this case where someone was shot four times.

The only other issue is who pulled the trigger. That's what I have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt. And no one has come into this court and contradicted Mr. Johnson or Mr. Crooks about who pulled the trigger.

Now, Mr. Lankford has several theories he'd like to throw out there on the table. And theories are a wonderful thing, but there's no evidence to support of them.

Sure, we can all hypothetically while X,
Y, Z could have happened, sure, sure. This could
have been a police execution of Carlton Thomas.
There's no evidence to support it. You have to make
your decision based on the evidence that was
brought forward in this case, the testimony, and
the exhibits, and the photographs. Not on Mr.
Lankford's theories. The evidence.

Mr. Lankford has some interesting

theories. He says Mr. Johnson is the murderer and so therefore Mr. Crooks is setting up Mr. Houston and protecting Mr. Johnson. He argues to you that perhaps Mr. Crooks was the murderer and Mr. Johnson is lying. Okay. Why would these people lie.

There's no reason for it. It doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Johnson came into court and told you he is Mr. Houston's friend. He doesn't want to be

Mr. Johnson came into court and told you he is Mr. Houston's friend. He doesn't want to be here. He doesn't want to be cooperating in this case.

Another thing Mr. Lankford said that I don't know where he's getting this from, but he's saying that Mr. Houston and Mr. Thomas were strangers. Well, how do we know that. We don't know that. Where is that coming from.

Mr. Johnson said he had done business with Mr. Thomas once, maybe twice. But all the rollers, all the grinders over there know the people who come there. There's no evidence to support the fact that Mr. Houston and Mr. Thomas were strangers. We just don't know that. You can't go out there and just hypotheticalize like that. It doesn't make any sense. We don't know how many times they had done business, if they have.

23

24

25

This is the most important thing, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Lankford tells you that Mr. Crooks had two months to figure out what happened so he could come into court and testify. Okay. And he had two months to talk to people in the hood to figure out exactly how this murder went down since -- according to Mr. Lankford Mr. Crooks wasn't there, right. So he's got to go talk to all the people in the hood and figure out how it went What Mr. Lankford leaves out is not only did he have to talk to people in the hood, he must have went and talked to the medical examiner too. And the medical examiner must have given him information to help set up Mr. Houston for a crime he didn't do. Okay.

For example, one of the most important things the medical examiner told us, and let me digress for a minute. When the medical examiner was on the stand he told us that gun shot wounds one, two and three, the three to the body were all consistent with somebody on the ground and somebody shooting over them. Mr. Lankford gets up and tells you, well, no, that's impossible for gun shot wound number three. He says, no, that's impossible.

Well, the expert told you it was

possible. Now, who do you believe; an expert, a medical examiner. And he said all someone has to do is twist their body slightly and that bullet will pass through just like that. We asked the medical examiner specifically those functions. He said these wounds are consistent with that scenario. What more can he tell you.

Furthermore, the abrasions on the knees.

Remember how the medical examiner turned those abrasions, he called them terminal abrasions.

Okay. I asked him what does that mean terminal abrasions. He said those are abrasions that occurred at the time of death. What does that mean. That means Carlton Thomas fell face first and got these abrasions on his knees.

How would Mr. Crooks know that. How would Mr. Crooks know that Mr. Thomas was shot in the face. How would Mr. Crooks know that when they recovered Mr. Thomas's clothes from the hospital, his money was gone. How he was just able to make up that Mr. Houston must have gone in his pockets and taken his money. How did he know unless the police, and the medical examiner, and the witnesses are all conspiring to set up Mr. Houston, because that's the choice you have to make in this case. It's

very easy.

One of two things happened. Either Mr. Crooks, Mr. Johnson, the medical examiner, all the police are conspiring to set up Mr. Houston for something he hasn't done or he did it. Which choice is there. That's what you're going to tell us with your verdict.

How would Mr. Crooks know that this body was rolled over. And we know it was because Officer Williams tells you there's the spot of blood that isn't where Mr. Thomas is found. Mr. Thomas is about a foot over. And that shows you when Mr. Thomas fell face forward with that horrible wound to his face, there's going to be blood right there.

Then when he's rolled over, there's not going to be blood. He's got on all these clothes. The wound is to his face. That's why he's not there on the blood. He was rolled over. How's Mr. Crooks know this. Then this is one heck of an elaborate setup, and Mr. Crooks is one heck of a detective, isn't he. You saw him on the stand. Do you think that he's that sophisticated. Do you think he's that good of a detective to set up Mr. Houston in this way.

Mr. Lankford tells you well where's the gun. Well, if Mr. Johnson was the murderer he would have had the gun he could have easily framed Mr. Houston with it. We don't know where the gun is. That doesn't mean somebody wasn't shot. That's what Mr. Lankford's telling you.

Well, if they didn't get a gun so nobody's shot, nobody's murdered. That doesn't make sense. You know somebody was shot.

Then you know what, I'm not sure Mr.

Johnson realized Mr. Crooks was out there either.

He had been drinking, doing drugs. You know, its

very possible Mr. Johnson didn't know Mr. Crooks

was out there. And that's actually a lot more

likely than the fact that they get together and

conspire to set Mr. Houston up and then get that

wrong on the stand. Again, that's one of those

choices. Did they conspire to set up Mr. Houston

and then forget that they were both out there.

Probably Mr. Johnson didn't see them.

Remember, Mr. Johnson told you there's all kinds of traffic going up and down that road.

Okay. All kinds of businesses being conducted. Mr. Crooks told you at one point he did leave that scene. Probably when he went to get his lady

friend, but he told you he did leave that scene.

He was coming and going. So you're not always

paying attention to where cars are parked out

there. But certainly if you were going to lie,

you'd get that part right.

Mr. Crooks does cooperate with the police and he told you why. If he didn't cooperate with them either he was going to have to kill Mr. Houston or Mr. Houston was going to kill him.

And when he does help set up Mr. Houston to get him arrested what does Mr. Houston do. Mr. Houston runs in the house. Locks himself in somebody else's flat. Refuses to come out when the police are there yelling police come on out. Come on out. He's hiding. Now, is that what you would do when the police approach you if you've done nothing wrong as a citizen. Do you go running into anybody else's house, lock the door and when the police actually get the keys to come in, do you try and keep the door closed. He's doing everything he can from getting caught.

Is that the way an innocent person acts, ladies and gentlemen. He's telling you by his own actions he's done something wrong. Why is that going on, ladies and gentlemen. Is this a big

conspiracy to set up an innocent man on a murder charge. Is that what you really think this is, or this is a story of a guilty man running and hiding to the last minute to keep from getting caught.

Yeah, I agree with Mr. Lankford. There wasn't any good motive to kill this man and unfortunately in most murder cases there are. It's a senseless, stupid tragedy. You shouldn't be out there killing people. We all agree with that. Yet, he did it, and you should hold him accountable for what he did.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to caution you, you may not discuss this matter among yourselves nor with anyone else.

Who is the juror whose daughter has a doctor's appointment? It's taken care of. Okay.

You may not discuss among yourselves nor with anyone else. We're going to let you go out and have a good lunch and ask you to be back here 1:30 at which time I will give you your instructions so you'll begin your deliberations. We'll rise for you to get your things to go to lunch. Everyone rise Jurors are free to go to lunch.

(Jury exits courtroom) 1 THE COURT: Rise for the jury, please. 2 (Jury enters courtroom.) 3 THE COURT: Do I have the stipulation that 4 all of our jurors are here and in their proper 5 places? 6 MR. HASSINGER: Yes, Judge. 7 MR. LANKFORD: Agreed, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Members of the jury, the 9 evidence and arguments in this case are now 10 finished, and I will now instruct you on the law 11 that applies to this case. Remember that you've 12 taken an oath to return a true and just verdict 13 based only on the evidence and my instructions on 1.4 the law. You must not let sympathy or prejudice 15 influence your decision. As jurors you must decide 16 what the facts of this case are. This is your job 17 and no one else's. 18 You must think about all of the evidence 19 20 and the testimony and then decide what each piece of evidence means, and how important you think it 21 is. This includes whether you believe what each of 22 the witnesses said. 23 What you decide about any fact in this 24 case is final. It is my duty to instruct you on the 25

1.

law. You must take the law as I give it to you.

If a lawyer had said something different about the law, follow what I say.

At various times I've already given you some instructions about the law. You should consider all of my instructions together as the law that you are to follow. You should not pay attention to some instructions and ignore others.

To sum up, it is your job to decide what the facts of this case are, to apply the law as I give it to you, and that way decide this case.

Every person accused of a crime is presumed to be innocent. This means that you must start with the presumption that the defendant is innocent. This presumption continues throughout the trial and entitles the defendant to a verdict of not guilty unless you're satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty.

Now, every crime is made up of parts called elements. The prosecution must prove each element of a crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant is not required to prove his innocence or to do anything.

If you find the prosecution had not proven every element beyond a reasonable doubt,

then you must find the defendant not guilty. A reasonable doubt is a fair, honest doubt growing out of the evidence or lack of evidence. It is not merely an imaginary or possible doubt, but a doubt based upon reason and common sense. A reasonable doubt is just that, a doubt that is reasonable after a careful and considered examination of the facts and circumstances of this case.

Now, every defendant has the absolute right not to testify. When you decide this case, you must not consider the fact that he did not testify. It must not affect your verdict in any way. When you discuss this case and decide on your verdict you may only consider the evidence that has been properly admitted in this case. Therefore, it is important for you to understand what is evidence and what is not evidence.

The evidence in this case includes only the sworn testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits that were admitted into evidence, and there was two stipulation of facts, which I will talk to you about later.

Now, many things are not evidence and you must be careful not to consider them as such. I will now describe some of things that are not evidence.

The fact that this defendant is charged with a crime and is on trial is not evidence.

Also, the lawyers' statements and arguments are not evidence. They're only meant to help you understand the evidence on each side's legal theory.

The questions that the lawyers put to the witnesses are also not evidence. You should consider these questions only as they give meaning to the witness's answers. You should only accept things a lawyer says that is supported by the evidence or by your own common sense and general knowledge.

Also, you have heard testimony about some police reports, I believe, during this trial and maybe some witness statements. Those reports and statements were not admitted as evidence during this trial. What you heard was testimony concerning them.

send out a note and say, please, send me Officer William's PCR, preliminary complaint report, you will not get that. That was not admitted into evidence. What you heard was testimony concerning those items.

Now, my comments, my rulings, my questions, and my instructions are also not evidence. It is my duty to see that this trial is conducted according to the law and to tell you the law that applies to this case.

However, when I make a comment or give an instruction, I'm not trying to influence your vote or express a personal opinion about the case.

If you believe that I have a personal opinion about how you should decide this case, you must pay no attention to that opinion. You are the only judges of the facts and you should decide this case from the evidence presented.

At times during this trial I have excluded evidence that was offered or stricken testimony that was heard. Do not consider those things in deciding this case. Make your decision only on the evidence that I let in and nothing else.

You should use your own common sense and general knowledge in weighing and judging the evidence. But you should not use any personal knowledge you may have about a particular place or a particular person or a particular event. To repeat once more, you must decide this case based

only on the evidence admitted during this trial.

Now, you should not decide this case based on which side presented more witnesses.

Instead you should think about each witness and each piece of evidence and whether you believe them. Then you must decide whether the testimony and evidence you believe prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty.

Now, facts can be proven by direct evidence from a witness or an exhibit. Direct evidence is evidence about what we actually see or hear.

For example, if you look outside and see rain falling, that is direct evidence that it is raining. Facts can also be proven by indirect or circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence is evidence that normally or reasonably leads to other facts.

So, for example, if you see a person come in from outside wearing a rain coat covered with small drops of water, that would be circumstantial evidence that it is raining.

You may consider circumstantial evidence by itself or a combination of circumstantial evidence, and direct evidence can be used to prove

the elements of a crime. In other words, you 1 should consider all the evidence that you believe. 2 3 You may consider whether the defendant had a reason to commit the alleged crime, but a 4 5 reason by itself is not enough to find a person guilty of a crime. 6 7 The prosecution does not have to prove 8 that the defendant had a reason to commit the 9 alleged crime. The prosecution only has to show 10 that the defendant actually committed the crime and 11 that he meant to do so. 12 Now, when the lawyers agree upon a 13 statement of facts, these are called stipulated 14 facts, and you may regard such stipulated facts as 15 true, but are not required to do so. And there were two stipulations entered 16 17 in this matter. The last stipulation being that on September 6th, which I believe was the date of this 18 19 event, 2002, the defendant was ineligible to 20 possess a firearm and that he had been convicted of 21 a felony, and that his eligibility had not been 22 restored; is that a correct statement? 23 MR. HASSINGER: Yes, Your Honor. 24 MR. LANKFORD: Yes, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: The other stipulation is that,

Cynthia Thomas, the mother of the deceased had testified, she would have testified that she identified the body of Mr. Carton Thomas on September 7, 2002 to the medical examiner. Is that a correct statement of the stipulation?

MR. HASSINGER: That is, Judge.
MR. LANKFORD: Again, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

When the lawyers agree upon statement of facts, these are called stipulated facts. You may regard such stipulated facts as true but are not required to do so.

Now, there's been some evidence that the defendant tried to run away at the time the police tried to arrest him. This evidence does not prove guilt. A person may run or hide for innocent reasons such as panic, mistake, or fear.

However, a person may also run or hide because a consciousness of guilt. You must decide whether this evidence is true, and if true, whether it shows the defendant had a guilty state of mind.

As I said before, it is your job to decide what the facts of this case are. You must decide which witnesses you will believe and how important you think their testimony is. You do not

have to accept or reject everything a witness says. You are free to believe all, none, or part of any person's testimony. In deciding which testimony you believe, you should rely on your own common sense and every day experience.

However, in deciding whether you believe a witness's testimony, you must set aside any bias or prejudice you may have based on race, gender or national origin of the witness.

Now, there's no fixed set of rules for judging whether you believe a witness, but it may help you to think about these questions. Was the witness able to see or hear clearly? How long was the witness watching or listening? Was anything else going on that might have distracted the witness? Did the witness seem to have a good memory? How did the witness look and act while testifying? Did the witness seem to be making an honest effort to tell the truth or did the witness seem to evade the questions or argue with the lawyers? Does the witness's age and maturity effect how you judge his or her testimony? Does the witness have any bias, prejudice or personal interest in how this case is decided? Had there been any promises, threats, suggestions or other

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

influences that effect on how the witness testified? 1 In general, does the witness have any 2 special reason to tell the truth or any special 3 reason to lie? 4 All in all, how reasonable does the 5 witness's testimony seem when you think about all 6 of the other evidence in this case. 7 Now, sometimes the testimony of different 8 witnesses will not agree. You must decide which 9 testimony you accept. You should think about 10 whether the disagreement is about something 11 important or not and whether you think someone is 12 lying or simply mistaken. 13 People see and hear things differently, 14 and witnesses may testify honestly but simply be 15 wrong about what they thought they saw or remembered. 16 It is also a good idea to think about 17 which testimony agrees best with all of the other 18 evidence in this case. 19 However, you may conclude that a witness 20 deliberately lied about something that is important 21 to how you decide this case. If so, you may choose 22 not to accept anything that witness said. 23 On the other hand, if you think the 24 witness lied about something but told the truth 25

about others, you may simply accept the part you think is true and ignore the rest.

Now, you have heard that the lawyers or lawyer's representative have talked to some of the witnesses. There is nothing wrong with this. A lawyer or lawyer's representative may talk to witnesses to find out what the witness knows about the case and what the witness's testimony will be.

You have heard testimony from Dr. Paul
Nora who has given his opinion as an expert in the
field of forensic pathology. Experts are allowed to
give opinions in courts about matters they are
experts on.

However, you do not have to believe an expert's opinion. Instead you should decide whether you believe in it, and how important you think it is.

When you decide whether you believe an expert's opinion, think carefully about the reasons he or she gave for his or her opinion and whether those reasons and facts are true. You should also think about the expert's qualification and whether his opinion makes sense when you think about all of the other evidence in this case.

You have heard testimony from several

witnesses who are police officers. That testimony is to be judged by the same standard as you use to evaluate the testimony of any other witness.

Now, there's been some testimony or some evidence that Jovan Johnson made an earlier statement that did not agree with his testimony during this trial. You must be very careful how you consider this evidence.

This statement was not made during this trial, so you may not consider it when you decide whether the elements of the crime have been proven. But I will go on and there is a caveat to that.

On the other hand, you may use it to help you decide whether you think Jovan Johnson is a truthful witness. Consider this statement carefully.

Ask yourself if the witness made the statement and whether it differs from the witness's testimony here in court. Then remember you may only use it to help you decide whether you believe Jovan Johnson's testimony here in court.

However, in this case if the witness testified that the earlier statement was true, or as in this case, if the earlier inconsistent statement was given under oath subject to the

penalty of perjury at the hearing, it was a preliminary examination if I remember correct, it may be considered as proof of the facts in the statement. And I believe that the question was what Mr. Johnson thought he might be charged with.

Now, the defendant in this case is charged with several counts. The first Count is a Count of First Degree Premeditated Murder. In order to establish this charge, the prosecution must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the defendant caused the death of Carlton Thomas. That is, that Mr. Thomas died as a result of being shot.

Second, the People have to establish that the Defendant intended to kill Carlton Thomas.

Third, the People have to establish that this intent to kill was premeditated, that is, thought out beforehand.

Fourth, the People have to establish that the killing was deliberate, which means that the Defendant considered the pros and cons of the killing and thought about it and choose his actions before he did it. There must have been real and substantial reflection for long enough to give a

reasonable person a chance to think twice about the intent to kill.

Our law does not state how much time is

Our law does not state how much time is needed. It is for you to decide if enough time passed under the circumstances of this case. The killing cannot be the result of a sudden impulse without thought or reflection.

And fifth, the killing cannot be justified, excused, or done under circumstances that would reduce it to the lessor crime to Second Degree Murder which I will explain to you in a few moments.

In order to show the Defendant is guilty of First Degree Premeditated Murder, the People have to establish first that the Defendant caused the death of Carlton Thomas. That is that Mr. Thomas died as a result of being shot.

Second, the People have to establish the Defendant intended to kill Carlton Thomas.

Third, the People have to establish that this intent to kill was premeditated, that is, thought out beforehand.

Fourth, the People have to establish that the killing was deliberate, which means that the Defendant considered the pros and cons of the

killing and thought about it and choose its actions before he did it. There must have been real and substantial reflection for long enough to give a reasonable person a chance to think twice about the intent to kill.

Our law, once again does not state how much time is needed. It is for you to decide if enough time passed under the circumstances of this case. The killing cannot be a result of a sudden impulse without thought or reflection.

And fifth, the killing cannot be justified, excused, or done under circumstances that would reduce it to the lessor crime of Second Degree Murder.

Now, in order to convict the Defendant of First Degree Premeditated Murder requires proof of a specific intent. This means that the prosecution must prove not only that the Defendant did certain acts, but that when he did so he did so with the intent to cause a particular result.

For the crime of First Degree Premeditated Murder, this means that the Prosecution must prove that the Defendant intended to kill Mr. Carlton Thomas.

Now, this is where we're talking about

1.3

the circumstantial evidence because you see nobody can cut open a person's mind and say look here, this is what the person intended.

The person's intent may be proven by what he said, what he did, how he did it, or any other fact or circumstances in evidence.

Now, you may also consider the lessor offense of Second Degree Murder. In order to establish this charge, the Prosecution must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant caused the death of Carlton Thomas; that is, that Mr. Thomas died as a result of being shot.

Second, the People have to establish that the Defendant had one of these three states of mind at the time of the act.

Now, listen to me very carefully.

Second, the People have to establish the Defendant had one of these three states of mind at the time of the act. The People have to establish either that the Defendant intended to kill Mr. Thomas, or the Defendant intended to do great bodily harm to Mr. Thomas, or the Defendant knowingly created a very high risk of death or great bodily harm knowing that death or such harm

would be the likely results of his actions.

Now, the two elements the People would have to establish beyond a reasonable doubt to show the Defendant is guilty of Second Degree Murder is, first, the Defendant caused the death of Carlton Thomas; that is, that Mr. Thomas died as a result of being shot.

Second, the People have to establish that at the time of the act that caused the death of Mr. Thomas, the Defendant had one of these three states of mind. The People have to establish either the Defendant intended to kill Carlton Thomas or the Defendant intended to do great bodily harm to Carlton Thomas, or that the Defendant knowingly created a very high risk of death or great bodily harm, knowing that death or such harm would be the likely result of his actions.

Now, you must think about all of the evidence and decide what the Defendant's state of mind was at the time of the alleged killing.

The Defendant's state of mind may be inferred from the kind of weapons used, the type of wounds inflicted, the act of words of the Defendant, and any other circumstances about the alleged killing. You may infer the Defendant

intended to kill and he used a dangerous weapon in a way that was likely to cause death.

Likewise, you may infer the Defendant intended the usual result that's from the use of a dangerous weapon. A gun is a dangerous weapon.

Premeditation and deliberation may be inferred from any action of the Defendant which shows planning or from any other circumstances surrounding the killing. The Prosecution need not prove a motive for killing, but you may consider evidence of motive in deciding whether there was premeditation and deliberation. Motive by itself does not prove premeditation and deliberation.

The next Count is the Count of Possession of a Firearm by a Felon. In order to establish this charge, the Prosecution must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

First, that the Defendant possessed a firearm in this state. It should be first, that the Defendant possessed, used, transported, sold, or received a firearm in this state.

Second, the People have to establish that the Defendant was convicted of a felony.

Third, the People have to establish that less than five years had passed since all

imprisonment was served or any term of probation was completed.

And there was a stipulation that the Defendant's eligibility had not been restored. So first, the People would have to establish that the Defendant possessed, or used, or transported, or sold, or received a firearm in this state.

Second, the People have to establish the Defendant was convicted of a felony.

And third, that less than five years had passed since all fines were paid and all imprisonment served or any term of probation was completed.

The final charge again, is that the Defendant is charged with the possession of a firearm at the commission or attempt to commit a felony.

In order to establish this charge, the Prosecution must prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, that the Defendant committed or attempted to commit the crime of Murder in the First Degree Premeditated or Second or Possession of a Firearm by a Felon which I've already defined for you. It's not necessary, however, that the Defendant be convicted of that crime.

And second, the People have to establish 1 that at the time the Defendant committed or attempted 2 to commit any of those crimes, he knowingly carried 3 or knowingly possessed a firearm. 4 A firearm includes any weapon from which 5 a dangerous object can be shot or propelled by the 6 7 use of explosives, gas, or air. To establish the Defendant is guilty of 8 possession of a firearm in the commission or an 9 attempt to commit a felony, the People have to 10 establish: 11 First, the Defendant committed or 12 intended to commit the crime of Murder in the First 13 Degree, Premeditated or Second Degree Murder or 14 Possession of a Firearm by a Felon. 15 Second, the People have to establish 16 that if the Defendant committed or attempted to 17 commit any of these crimes, he knowingly possessed 18 or knowingly carried a firearm. 19 Now, once you go to the jury room, you 20 should first choose a foreperson, he or she should 21 22 see to it discussions are carried on in a businesslike way and that everyone has a fair 23 chance to be heard. 24

25

The verdict in a criminal case must be

unanimous in order to return a verdict. It's necessary that each of you agree upon that verdict.

In the jury room you will discuss this case amongst yourselves, but ultimately each of you will have to make up your own minds. The verdict must represent each individual considered judgment of each juror.

It is your duty as jurors to talk to each other and make every reasonable effort to reach an agreement. Express your opinions and reasons for them, but keep an open mind as you listen to your fellow jurors. Rethink your opinions and do not hesitate to change your mind if you decide you were wrong. Try your best to work out your differences.

However, although you should try to reach an agreement, none of you should give up your honest opinions about the case just because other jurors disagree with you, or just for the sake of reaching a verdict. In the end your vote must be your own.

Now, when you consider the First Count, that is, First Degree Premeditated Murder, you must first consider the charge of First Degree Premeditated Murder. If you also agree that the Defendant is guilty of a crime, you may stop your deliberations

and go onto the other Count or return your verdict.

If you believe the Defendant is not guilty of Murder in the First Degree, Premeditated, or if you're unable to agree about that crime, you may then consider the lesser serious offense of Murder in the Second Degree.

It is up to you to decide how long this
Defendant took on the principal charge, that is,
First Degree Premeditated Murder before discussing
the lesser offense of Second Degree Murder. Of
course, you may go back to the original offense
after discussing the lesser offense.

If you want to communicate with me from this point forward, simply have the foreperson write a note and give it to the officer. Do that by writing a note. Come to the jury room door, knock on the door, do not open the door because I may be disposing of other cases.

Knock on the door, in a few moments when we're able, one of the officers will give you an answer knock and we'll accept the note. It's not proper from this point on for you to talk directly to the judge, the lawyers, court officers, or other persons involved in this case, so unless you're in the courtroom where we can take down every word

that's said, or you have written a note, you cannot disclose any information.

When you discuss this case, you must not let anyone, even me, know how your voting stands. Therefore, until you return with an unanimous verdict, do not reveal this information to anyone outside the jury room. And when you have reached a unanimous verdict, please write a note stating we've reached a verdict and give that to the officer.

We have prepared a verdict form for you.

Mark your verdict on the form when you've reached

your verdict.

It is the duty of the Judge to fix the penalty within the limits provided by law. If you want to look at any of the exhibits that have been admitted into evidence, just ask for them and we will deliver them to you.

Now, on Count I there are three possible verdicts; Not Guilty, or Guilty of Murder in the First Degree Premeditated, or Guilty of Murder in the Second Degree.

On Count II, there are two possible verdicts. They are Not Guilty or Guilty of Possession of a Firearm by a Felon.

On Count II, there are two possible 1 verdicts, they are, Not Guilty or Guilty of 2 Possession of a Firearm in Committing or Attempting 3 to Commit a Felony. 4 Gentleman, any problems with the charge? 5 MR. HASSINGER: I'm satisfied, Judge. 6 MR. LANKFORD: Likewise, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: You've seen the verdict form 8 with the discrepancy I just called on Count number 9 two which I'm going to have to change. Any problem 10 with the verdict form? 11 MR. HASSINGER: No, Judge. 12 MR. LANKFORD: No. Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Please swear the officers. 14 15 (Whereupon Officers sworn) 16 THE COURT: Now, ladies and gentlemen, the 17 Clerk is about to pull two jurors who will not be deliberating. I want to tell those jurors ahead of 18 19 time we do appreciate your services, but you will not be able to talk about this case until you get a 20 21 telephone call from my clerk or secretary telling 22 you that a verdict has been rendered, because if somebody gets the flu or sick before the verdict is 23 reached, we can always bring back one of those or 24 two of those jurors to reconstitute the jury of 12, 25

so we don't have to go and retry the case again. 1 So what's going to happen is once your 2 name is called, you will step down and one of the 3 officers will take you to the clerk's office where 4 you will leave a telephone number where we can 5 6 reach you. 7 And after the verdict is rendered, you will be told that you may discuss this case. But 8 until that time, we'd ask you just not to discuss 9 this case both here and at home. 10 All right, you're ready to pull the two 11 12 jurors? 13 THE CLERK: Kenneth Hagen, and Katherine Hoeft. 14 THE COURT: To the both of you and to all 15 16 the parties in this matter, we appreciate your 17 services as jurors. Thank you ladies and 18 gentlemen, we're going to rise and have you step 19 into the jury room. You may begin your deliberations 20 as soon as you are all inside the jury room. (Jury exits courtroom) 21 22 (Court is in recess) 23 (Court reconvenes) 2.4 THE COURT: We're going to bring the jury 25 in.

(Jury enters courtroom) 1. THE COURT: Do I have the stipulation that 2 all of our jurors are here and in their proper 3 4 places? MR. HASSINGER: So stipulated Judge. 5 MR. LANKFORD: Agreed. 6 THE COURT: Would you please take the 7 verdict. 8 9 THE CLERK: Members of the jury, have you agreed upon a verdict, if so, who shall speak for 10 you? Your name for the record, please. 11 JUROR MORRIS: John Morris. 12 THE CLERK: Thank you. How do you find the 13 14 Defendant, Michon Houston as to Count IV? JUROR MORRIS: Guilty of first degree 15 murder. 16 THE CLERK: As to Count two? 17 JUROR MORRIS: Guilty of possession of a 18 firearm by a felon. 19 20 THE COURT: And Count III? JUROR MORRIS: Guilty of Possession of 21 Firearm in the Commission or Attempt to Commit a 22 Felony. 23 THE CLERK: Thank you. Members of the 24 jury could you please all stand. Raise your right 25

1	hand and listen to your verdict as recorded by the
2	court.
3	You solemnly swear or affirm that you
4	find the Defendant Michon Houston guilty of Count
5	one, first degree murder, guilty of Count two
6	possession of a firearm by a felon, and guilty of
7	Count three, possession of a firearm in a
8	commission or attempt to commit a felony, so say
9	you Mr. Foreman, and so say you all members of the
10	jury?
11	JURY PANEL: Yes.
12	THE CLERK: Thank you.
13	THE COURT: Please be seated. Poll the
14	jurors.
15	THE CLERK: Juror in seat number one, was
16	that and is that your verdict?
17	JUROR #1: Yes.
18	THE CLERK: Seat two, was that and is that
19	your verdict?
20	JUROR #2: Yes.
21	THE CLERK: Seat three, was it and is that
22	your verdict?
23	JUROR #3: Yes.
24	THE CLERK: Seat four, was this and is
25	this your verdict?
	H

1	JUROR #4: Yes.
2	THE CLERK: Seat five, was that and is
3	that your verdict?
4	JUROR #5: Yes.
5	THE CLERK: Seat six, was that and is that
6	your verdict?
7	JUROR #6: Yes.
8	THE CLERK: Seat seven, was that and is
9	that your verdict?
10	JUROR #7: Yes.
11	THE CLERK: Seat eight, was that and is
12	that your verdict?
13	JUROR #8: Yes.
14	THE CLERK: Seat nine, was that and is
15	that your verdict?
16	JUROR #9: Yes.
17	THE CLERK: Seat ten, was that and is that
18	your verdict?
19	JUROR #10: Yes.
20	THE CLERK: Seat eleven, was that and is
21	that your verdict?
22	JUROR #11: Yes.
23	THE CLERK: And seat thirteen, was that
24	and is that your verdict?
25	JUROR #13: Yes.
	II

THE CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the court and all the parties in this matter and the People of the state of Michigan appreciate the services that you've rendered to the justice system in arriving at your verdict. We appreciate you taking time out your busy lives to come and serve on jury duty. Were not the person like yourselves willing to make the sacrifice, our system of justice would fail because then we could not have any jury trials.

In just a few moments we're going to rise and have you step back into the jury room. When things are secured, you will be permitted to go home. I'm going to ask the foreperson to hand me the verdict forms as you're stepping back inside. Everyone rise. Jurors are free to step back into this jury room.

(Jury exits courtroom)

THE COURT: You may be seated. He's remanded to the jail. The disposition date?

THE CLERK: That will be April the 22nd. That's a Tuesday.

MR. LANKFORD: That's a fine date. Thank you.

THE COURT: April 22nd is good. Okay, he can go back with the officers. Gentlemen, I'm going to talk to my jurors and then I'll have you take them out. Okay. (Proceeding concluded)

REPORTER'S

11.

1.9

I do hereby certify that I have

CERTIFICATE

recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and that the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter; and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.

Debra L. Finch

Certified Shorthand Reporter - 5702

Dated: August 9, 2003